

17-8

A  
DISCOURSE  
Concerning the  
IDOLATRY  
Practised in the  
CHURCH  
OF  
ROME,

A N D

The hazard of *Salvation* in the  
Communion of it : in answer to some  
Papers of a Revolted Protestant.

WHEREIN

A particular Account is given of the  
*Fanaticisms* and *Divisions* of that Church.

---

The Third Edition corrected.

---

By *Edward Stillingfleet*; D. D.  
Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty.

---

London,, Printed by *Robert white* for *Henry Mortlock* at the  
sign of the Phoenix in *S. Pauls Church-yard*, and at  
the *White-Hart* in *Westminster-Hall*. 1672.

---







T H E  
P R E F A C E.



*Although I see no great effect of the Courtship commonly used towards the Candid and Ingenuous Reader; unless it be in diverting the censure*

§ 1.  
The necessity of writing in these Controversies.

*from the Book to the Preface: yet in some case it looks like a breach of the Readers privilege, not to give him an account of the occasion and design of a Book. Especially, when the matter handled therein, hath been thought to have been so thoroughly discussed before, and is of so general concernment, that every pretender thinks he knows as much already, as is to be known in it. Whereas nothing hath been more to the advantage of our Adversaries than this, that the things in dispute between us were generally no better understood, by the persons they have had their designs upon. For*

## The Preface.

as soon as they have baffled their ignorance and mistakes, these have been ready to yield up themselves and the Cause, imagining nothing more could be said for it, than they could say for themselves. Whereby our Church hath not only suffered in its reputation, as far as that is concerned in the weakness of some of its members; but strange boasts and triumphs have been made by those of the Church of Rome, when such who understood not their own Religion have embraced theirs. While these disputes were fresh in the world, every one thought himself concerned to enquire into them; but since our Church hath been so long established on the principles of the Reformation, and other unhappy controversies have risen up; the most have taken this Cause for granted, and thought it needless to enquire any farther into the Grounds of it.

The present arts used by our Adversaries to gain Profelyts.

Which our Adversaries perceiving, they have found far greater success in their attempts upon particular persons, than in publick Writings: for these have only provoked others to lay open the palpable weakness of their Cause, whereas in the other by their ways of Address, and all the arts of Insinuation, they have instilled their principles into the minds of some less judicious persons,

## The Preface.

persons, before they were aware of it. Thence it is easie to observe that the greatest mischief they have done, hath been like the Pestilence, by walking in darkness, and spreading their infection by whispers in corners. All their hopes and strength lye in the weakness and credulity of the persons they deal with; but if they meet with any who truly understand the differences between us, they soongive them over as untractable. But to such, whose employments have not given them leave to enquire, or whose capacity hath not been great enough to discern their Sophistry, their first work is, to make a false representation both of the Doctrines and practice of their Church; and if they be of such easie faith to believe them, they from thence perswade them into an ill opinion of their Teachers, who possessed them with so bad thoughts of such a Church as theirs. A Church of so great Holiness (as may be seen by the Saint-like lives of their Popes and Converts) a Church of so great Antiquity (bating only the Primitive times) a Church of so admirable Unity (saving the divisions in it) a Church so free from any Fanatick heats (as any one may believe that will.) If this first assault doth not make them yield, but they desire at least time to consider,

## The Preface.

consider, and advise in a matter of so great importance; then they tell them, there is not a man of our Church dares give any of them a meeting; if they offer to put it to a tryal, they will appoint a day which they foresee will be most inconvenient for the persons they are to meet with. If upon that account, it be declined or deferred, this is spread abroad for a Victory; if it be accepted then one thing or other happens that they cannot come; either the person goes out of town unexpectedly, or his Superiours have forbidden him, or such conferences are not safe for them (they are so sorely persecuted) or at last, what good can an hours talk do to satisfy any one in matters of Religion? But if there be no remedy, which they are seldom without; and a conference happen, (which they scarce ever yield to, but when they have already gained the person for whose sake it is;) then whosoever was baffled, they are sure to go away with the triumph; and as an evidence of it, such a person went off from our Church upon it, when he was made sure of their side before. If this way takes not, then a Set of Questions is ready to be sent; if another be returned to them to be answered at the same time, this is declined, and complained of as hard dealing,

## The Preface.

dealing, as though they had only the privilege of putting Questions, and we the duty of answering them. If answers be given to them, after a Pass or two they put an end to the tryal of their skill in that place, and seek for another to shew it in. But if the Papers chance to be slighted, or business hinders a present answer, or there be a reasonable presumption, that the person concerned hath already forsaken our Church, this becomes the occasion of a new triumph; the Papers are accounted unanswerable (as the Spanish Armado was called invincible, which we thank God we found to be otherwise) and it may be are demanded again as Trophies, to be preserved for the glory of the Catholick Cause.

All these several ways I have had experience of in the compass of a few years, since by command I was publickly engaged in the Defence of so excellent a Cause, as that of our Church against the Church of Rome. I confess it seemed somewhat hard to me, to be put to answer so many several Papers, which I have received upon their tampering with particular persons of our Church, while my Book it self remained unanswered by them, after so many years of trying their strength about it. (For

§. 3.  
The occasion of this present writing.

## The Preface.

those two who in some small measure have attempted it, have performed it in the way that Ratts answer Books, by gnawing some of the leaves, for the body and design of it remains wholly untouched by them.) But for the satisfaction of any person who desired it, I was not willing to decline any service, which tended to so good an end, as the preserving any member of our Church in the communion of it: Which was the occasion of this present writing. For some time since, the Person concerned, after some discourses with her, brought me the two Questions mentioned in the beginning of the Book; to which I returned a speedy answer, in the midst of many other employments; not long after, I received the Reply; but hearing for a great while no further of the Person for whose sake this Discourse began, and having affairs more than enough, to take up my time, I laid aside the Papers, supposing that business at an end. But about Christmalls last, they were called for by a near Friend of the Party concerned, and a personal Conference being declined, an intimation was given me, that the Papers were thought unanswerable. I began to fear so too, for at first I could not find them; but as soon as I did, I found the great  
im-



## The Preface.

improvement they had made by lying so long, for what at first I looked on as inconsiderable, was in that time thought to be too strong to be meddled with; and I could not tell what they might come to in time, if I let them alone any longer. And I was informed, by a worthy Person, that I. S. the man of confidence and principles; had expressed great wonder I had not answered them; as though we had no cause to wonder that the noble Science of Controversie should be so abandoned by him, and that a man of such metal should all this while leave his poor Demonstrations alone to defend themselves? Upon these suggestions I resolved, as fast as other employments would give leave (for we are not those happy men to have only one thing to mind) to give a full and punctual answer to them. Which I have now made publick, and printed the Papers themselves at large, that my Adversary may not complain of any injury done him by mis-representing his words or meaning. And besides other reasons, I the rather chose to appear in publick, to draw them from their present way of pickeering and lying under hedges, to take advantage of some stragling members of our Church, not so able to defend themselves, and

## The Preface.

*whom they rather steal from us than conquer, being blinded with their smoke, more than overcome by any strength of Argument. If they have any thing to say, either against our Church, or in Defence of their own, let them come into the open Field, from which they have of late so wisely withdrawn themselves, finding so little success in it.*

§. 4.  
Of the  
manner  
and design  
of the  
writing.

*And since these Disputes must be, I am very well pleased, that the Adversary I have now to deal with, hath the Character of a Learned and Ingenuous man; and I do not desire he should lose it, in the Debate between us; hoping that nothing shall proceed from me, but what likewise becomes a fair and ingenuous Adversary. If I were not fully satisfied that we have truth and reason on our side, I should never have been engaged in these combats; I am so great a friend to the peace of the Christian world, that I could take more pleasure in ending one Controversie, than in being able to handle as many as the most Voluminous Schoolmen have ever done: For however Noble some may think, the Science of Controversie to be, I am not fond of the practice of it; especially, being managed with so much heat and passion, such scorn and contempt of Adversaries,*

## The Preface.

ries, so many reproaches and personal reflections (as they commonly are) as if men forgot to be Christians, when they began to be Disputants. I do not think it such a mighty matter to throw dirt in a mans face, and then to laugh at him, or (rather to take a Metaphor now from dry weather) to raise such a dust as may endanger the eye-sight of weaker persons. I think it no great skill to make things appear either ridiculous or dark, but to give them their due Colours, and set them in the clearest light shews far more art and ingenuity. And even that smartness of expression, without which Controversie will hardly go down with many, seems but like the throwing Vinegar upon hot Coals, which gives a quick scent for the present, but vanishes immediately into smoke and air. In matters of Truth and Religion, Reason and evidence ought to sway men, and not passion and noise; and though men cannot command their judgements, they may and ought to do their expressions. And although this looks as like an Apologie for a dull Book as may be, yet I had much rather it should suffer for want of wit and smartness, than of good nature and Christianity. My design is to represent the matters in difference between us truly, to report faithfully,

## The Preface.

*and to argue closely ; and by these to shew that no person can have any pretence of reason to leave our Church, to embrace the communion of the Church of Rome ; because the danger is so much greater there, in the nature of their Worship and tendency of their doctrine ; and what they object most against us in point of Fanaticism and divisions , will equally hold against them ; so that they have no advantages above us, but have many apparent dangers which we have not.*

§. 5.  
Of the  
charge of  
Idolatry  
against the  
Church of  
Rome.

*Among the chiefest dangers in the communion of that Church, I have insisted on that of Idolatry ; not to make the breach wider than some others have done, but to let persons first understand the greatness of the danger before they run into it. I wish I could acquit them from so heavy a charge, but I cannot force my judgement : and while I think them guilty, it would be unfaithfulness in me, not to warn those of it, whom it most concerns to understand it. And where other things are suble and nice, tedious and obscure, this lyes plain to the conscience of every man ; if the Church of Rome be guilty of Idolatry, our separation can be no Schism either before God or man, because our communion would be a sin. And although it may be only an excess  
of*

## The Preface.

*of charity, in some few learned persons, to excuse that Church from Idolatry, (although not all who live in the communion of it: ) yet upon the greatest search I can make, I think there is more of charity than judgement in so doing. For the proof of it, I must refer the Reader to the following Discourse. And that I may not be thought in so severe a censure, to contradict the sense of our Church, (which I have so great a regard, to) I shall here shew, that this charge of Idolatry hath been managed against the Church of Rome, by the greatest and most learned defenders of it ever since the Reformation.*

*What greater discovery can be made of the sense of our Church, than by the Book of Homilies, not barely allowed, but subscribed to as containing godly and wholsom doctrine, and necessary for these times? and nothing can be more plainly delivered therein, than that the Church of Rome is condemned for Idolatry. So the third part of the Sermon against the peril of Idolatry concludes, Ye have heard it evidently proved in these Homilies against Idolatry, by Gods Word, the Doctors of the Church, Ecclesiastical Histories, reason and experience, that Images have been and be worshipped, and so*

*Ann. 35.*

*Homil. part 2. p. 75.*

*Idolatry*

## The Preface.

Idolatry committed to them to the great offence of Gods Majesty, and danger of infinite souls, &c. *Who the Author of these Homilies was, is not material to enquire, since their authority depends not on the Writer, but the Churches approbation of them; but Dr. Jackson not only calls him the worthy and learned Author of the Homilies concerning the peril of Idolatry, but saith, he takes him to be a Reverend Bishop of our Church: and no wonder, since the most eminent Bishops in that time of Queen Elizabeth, (wherein these Homilies were added to the former) did all assert and maintain the same thing. As Bishop Jewell in his excellent Defence of the Apology of the Church of England, and answer to Harding, wherein he proves, that to give the honour of God to a creature, is manifest Idolatry, as the Papists do, saith he, in adoration of the Host, and the Worship of Images: And his works ought to be looked on with a higher esteem than any other private person, being commanded to be placed in Churches to be read by the people. Of all persons of that Age none could be less suspected to be Puritically inclined, than Archbishop Whitgift; yet in his Learned Defence of the Church*

Dr. Jackson  
Original  
of Unbe-  
lieff, Sect. 4.  
Ch 3 i.

D. fence of  
the Apolo-  
gy, Ch 7.  
div 2.  
p 552.  
Answer to  
Hardi g. 8  
articl p. 18;  
Art. 14.  
p. 358.  
p. 382.



## The Preface.

Church of *England* against *T. C.* *he makes good the same charge in these words* ; I do as much mislike the distinction of the Papists, and the intent of it as any man doth, neither do I go about to excuse them from wicked, and without repentance and Gods singular mercy, damnable Idolatry. There are, *saith he*, three kinds of Idolatry ; one is, when the true God is worshipped, by other means and ways, than he hath prescribed, or would be worshipped, *i. e. against his express command, which is certainly his meaning* : the other is, when the true God is worshipped with false Gods : the third is, when we worship false Gods either in heart, mind, or in external creatures living or dead, and altogether Forget the worship of the true God. All these three kinds are detestable, but the first is the least and the last is the worst. The Papists worship God otherwise than his will is, and otherwise than he hath prescribed, almost in all points of their worship ; they also give to the creature, that which is due to the Creator, and sin against the first Table ; yet are they not, for all that I can see or learn, in the third kind of Idolatry ; and therefore if they repent

Defence of  
the Answer  
to the Ad-  
monition,  
tr. 8. p. 152.

un-



## The Preface.

unfeignedly; they are not to be cast either out of the Church, or out of the Ministry. The Papists have little cause to thank me, or see me, for any thing I have spoken in their behalf as yet, you see that I place them among wicked and damnable Idolaters. *Thus far that Wise and Learned Bishop. After him we may justly reckon* Bishop Bilson, *than whom none did more learnedly in that time defend the perpetual Government of Christs Church by Bishops, (nor it may be since :) who in a set discourse, at large proves the Church of Rome guilty of Idolatry.* 1. In the Worship of Images; the having of which, *he saith*, was never Catholick, and the worshipping of them was ever wicked by the judgement of Christs Church: and that, the Worship even of the Image of Christs is Heathenism and Idolatry; and to Worship it makes it an Idol; and burning Incense to it is Idolatry, *which he there proves at large*; and that the Image of God made with hands, is a false God, and no likeness of his, but a lewd imagination of theirs, set up to feed their eyes with the contempt of his Sacred Will, dishonour of his Holy Name, and open injury to his Divine Nature. 2. In the adoration of

Bish. Bilson  
Disp. of  
Christian  
subjection,  
part. 4.  
p. 319.

p. 321.

p. 324.

p. 532, &c.

## The Preface.

of the Host, of which he treats at large. After these it will be less needful to produce the testimonies of Dr. Fulk, Dr. Reynolds, Dr. Whitaker, who all asserted and proved the Church of Rome, guilty of Idolatry: and I cannot find one person, who owned himself to be of the Church of England, in all Queen Elizabeths reign, who did make any doubt of it. Let us now come, to the reign of King James. And here in the first place we ought to set down the judgement of that Learned Prince himself, who so thoroughly understood the matters in controversie between us and the Church of Rome, as appears by his Premonition to all Christian Princes; wherein after speaking of other points, he comes to that of Reliques of Saints, But for the worshipping of either of them or Images, I must, saith he, account it damnable Idolatry; and after adds, that the Scriptures are so directly, vehemently, and punctually against it, as I wonder what brain of man, or suggestion of Satan durst offer it to Christians: and all must be salved with nice and philosophical distinctions——Let them therefore that maintain this doctrine, answer it to Christ at the latter day, when he shall accuse them of Idolatry:

Dr. Fulk's  
confutation  
of an  
Idolatrours  
Treatise of  
Nicol. Sanders.

Dr. Reynolds  
de Idolat.  
Eccles. Rom.  
Dr. Whitaker, c. Du-  
raun, l. 5.  
p. 133.

K. James  
his works  
p. 303.

## The Preface.

*Is. Casaub.  
Ep ad Car-  
din. Perron,  
ad quartam  
Instant.*

*Ad Torti  
lib. um re-  
spo. p. 312.  
Answer to  
Perron  
20 chap.  
p. 58.*

*Bish. Abbot  
against  
Bishop,  
Ton. 2.  
p. 1105.*

latry : and then I doubt if he will be paid with such nice Sophistical distinctions. *And when Isaac Casaubon was employed by him to deliver his opinion to Cardinal Perron, mentioning the practices of the Church of Rome in invocation of Saints, he saith,* that the Church of England did affirm, that those practices were joyned with great impiety. Bishop Andrews, *whom no man suspects of want of learning, or not understanding the doctrine of our Church, was also employed to answer Cardinal Bellarmin who had writ against the King : and doth he decline charging the Church of Rome with Idolatry ? No, so far from it, that he not only in plain terms charges them with it, but saith,* that Bellarmin runs into Heresie, nay, into madness to defend it : *and in his answer to Perron he saith,* it is most evident, by their Breviaries, Hours, and Rosaries, that they pray directly, absolutely and finally to Saints ; and not meerly to the Saints ; to pray to God for them, but to give what they pray for themselves. *In the same time of King James, Bishop Abbot writ his Answer to Bishop ; in which he saith,* that the Church of Rome by the Worship of Images, hath matched all the Idolatries of

of the Heathens, and brought all their  
 jugling devices into the Church, abusing  
 the ignorance and simplicity of the peo-  
 ple as grossly and damnably as ever they  
 did. *Towards the latter end of his* Reign  
*came forth* Bishop Whites Reply to  
 Fisher, *and he calls* the worshipping of  
 Images, a Superstitious dotage, a palliate  
 Idolatry; a remainder of Paganism, con-  
 demned by Sacred Scripture, censured  
 by Primative Fathers, and a Seminary  
 of direful contention and mischief in  
 the Church of Christ. *Dr. Field charg-*  
*eth the* Invocation of Saints with such  
 Superstition and Idolatry as cannot be  
 excused. We charge the adherents of  
 the Church of *Rome* with gross Idola-  
 try, (*saieth* Bishop Usher *in his* Sermon  
*preached before the Commons A.D. 1620.*)  
 because that contrary to Gods express  
 Commandment they are found to be  
 worshippers of Images. Neither will  
 it avail them here to say, that the Ido-  
 latry forbidden in the Scripture is that  
 only which was used by the Jews and  
 Pagans: For as well might one plead,  
 that Jewish or Heathenish fornication  
 was here only reprehended, as Jewish  
 or Heathenish Idolatry. But as the one  
 is a foul sin, whether it be committed  
 by

*Whites Re-*  
*ply to*  
*Fisher.*  
*p. 209.*

*Dr. Field*  
*of the*  
*Church,*  
*l. 3 ch. 20.*  
*p. 109.*

*Bish. ushers*  
*Sermon*  
*before the*  
*Commons,*  
*p. 30.*

by Jew, Pagan or Christian: so, if such as profess the Name of Christ shall practise that which the Word of God condemneth in Jews or Pagans for Idolatry, their profession is so far from diminishing, that it augmenteth rather the hainousness of the crime. *About the same time came forth* Bishop Downams *Book of Anti-christ, wherein he doth at large prove*, That to give divine honour to a creature, is Idolatry; and that the Papists do give it in the Worship of Saints, the Host and Images: *which is likewise done, nearer our own times, by* Bishop Davenant, *and Dr. Jackson.*

*I shall conclude all (although I might produce more) with the testimony of* Archbishop Laud, *who in his Conference, saith*, the ancient Church knew not the adoration of Images; and the modern Church of *Rome* is too like to Paganism in the practice of it, and driven to scarce intelligible subtilties in her Servants Writings that defend it; and this without any care had of millions of Souls unable to understand her subtilties, or shun her practice: *and in his Marginal Notes upon* Bellarmin *(written with his own hand, now in my possession) where Bellarmin answers the testimony of*  
the

Downam de  
Antichristo.  
l. 5, c. 1, 2.  
Etc.

Davenant.  
deter. quæst.  
18.

D. Jacksons  
Original  
of Unbe-  
lief, sect. 4.

Archbish.  
Lauds  
Conferen.  
p. 277.

Bell. de  
Sacrif. beat.  
l. 1. c. 20.

*the Council of Laodicea against the worship of Angels, by saying, That it doth not condemn all Worship of Angels, but only that which is proper to God; he replies, That Theodoret who produced that testimony of the Council, expressly mentions the praying to Angels; therefore, saith he, the praying to them was that Idolatry which the Council condemns. By this we see, that the most Eminent and Learned Defenders of our Church, of greatest authority in it, and zeal for the Cause of it against enemies of all sorts, have agreed in the charge of Idolatry against the Church of Rome.*

*And I cannot see why the authority of some very few persons, though of great Learning, should bear sway against the constant opinion of our Church ever since the Reformation. Since our Church is not now to be formed according to the singular Fancies of some few (though Learned men;) much less to be modelled by the Caprichio's of Superstitious Fanaticks, who prefer some odd opinions and ways of their own, before the received doctrine and practice of the Church they live in. Such as these, we rather pity their weakness, than regard their censures; and are only sorry when our Adversaries make such*  
pro-



## The Preface.

properties of them, as by their means to beget in some a disaffection to our Church. Which I am so far from (whatever malice and peevishness may suggest to the contrary) that upon the greatest enquiry I can make, I esteem it the best Church of the Christian World; and think my time very well employed (what ever thanks I meet with for it) in defending its Cause, and preserving persons in the communion of it.

---

T H E

---





# THE CONTENTS.

---

## CHAP. I.

*Of the Idolatry practised in the Church of  
Rome, in the Worship of Images.*

**T**HE introduction, concerning the occasion  
of the debate. The Church of Rome  
makes its members guilty of Hypo-  
crisie or Idolatry: First, Of the  
Worship of God by Images: Some propositions  
for clearing the notion of Divine Worship. It  
is in Gods power to determine the way of his  
Worship, which being determined, Gods Law,  
and not our intention, is to be the rule of Wor-  
ship. The main question is, Whether God hath  
forbidden the worshipping of himself by an  
Image, under the notion of Idolatry? Of the  
meaning of the second Commandment, from the  
terms therein used; the large sense and impor-

C

tance

## The Contents.

tance of them, which cannot be understood only of Heathen Idols. Of the reason of that Law, from Gods infinite and invisible nature : How far that hath been acknowledged by Heathens ? The Law against Image Worship no ceremonial Law, respecting merely the Jews ; the reason against it made more clear by the Gospel : The wiser Heathen did not worship their Images as Gods, yet their worship condemned as Idolatry. The Christian Church believed the reason of this Law to be immutable ; Of the Doctrine of the second Council of Nice ; the opposition to it in Greece, Germany, France and England. Of the Scripture Instances of Idolatry contrary to the second Commandment, in the Golden Calf, and the Calves of Dan and Bethel. Of the distinction used to excuse image worship from being Idolatry : The vanity and folly of them. The instances supposed to be parallel answered.

P. 43.

---

### CHAP. II.

#### *Of their Idolatry in Adoration of the Host, and Invocation of Saints.*

*The Argument proposed, concerning the Adoration of the Host ; the insufficiency of the Answer to it manifested : supposing equal revelation for Transubstantiation as for Christs Divinity, yet not the same reason for Worshipping the Host as the person of Christ, the great disparity between these two at large discovered ; the Controversie truly*

## The Contents.

truly stated, concerning *Adoration of the Host*: and it is proved, that no man, on the principles of the Roman Church, can be secure he doth not commit Idolatry in it. The confession of our Adversaries, that the same Principles will justify the Worship of any Creature. No such motives to believe Transubstantiation as the Divinity of Christ. Bishop Taylor's Testimony answered by himself. To Worship Christ in the Sun, as lawful as to Worship him in the Host. The grossest Idolatry excusable; on the same grounds. The argument proposed and vindicated, concerning the Invocation of Saints practised in the Church of Rome. The Fathers Arguments against the Heathens, hold against Invocations of Saints; the state of the Controversy, about Idolatry, as managed by them. They make it wholly unlawful, to give divine Worship to any Creature, how excellent soever. The Worship, not only of Heathen Gods, but of Angels condemned. The common evasions answered. Prayer more proper to God, than Sacrifice. No such disparity as is pretended, between the manner of Invoking Saints, and the Heathens Invoking their Deities. In the Church of Rome, they do more than pray to Saints to pray for them, proved from the present most Authentick Breviaries. Supposing that were all, it would not excuse them. St. Austin no friend to Invocation of Saints. Practices condemned by the Church pleaded for it. Of Negative points being Articles of faith.

F. 95.

# The Contents.

---

## CHAP. III.

### *Of the hindrances of a good Life, and of Devotion in the Roman Church.*

*The Doctrines of the Roman Church prejudicial to Piety. The Sacrament of Penance, as taught among them, destroys the necessity of a good life. The Doctrine of Purgatory takes away the care of it; as appears by the true stating it, and comparing that Doctrine with Protestants. How easie it is, according to them, for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. Purgatory dreadful to none, but poor and friendless. Sincerity of devotion hindred, by prayers in an unknown Tongue. The great absurdity of it manifested. The effects of our Ancestors devotion had been as great, if they had said their prayers in English. The language of prayer proved to be no indifferent thing, from S. Pauls arguments. No universal consent for prayers in an unknown tongue, by the confession of their own Writers. Of their doctrine of the efficacy of Sacraments; that it takes away all necessity of devotion, in the minds of the receivers. This complained of by Cassander and Arnaud; but proved against them, to be the doctrine of the Roman Church, by the Canons of the Council of Trent. The great easiness of getting Grace by their Sacraments. Of their discouraging*  
the

## The Contents.

the reading the Scriptures, A standing rule of devotion necessary. None so fit to give it, as God himself: This done by him in the Scriptures. All persons therefore concerned to read them. The Arguments against reading the Scriptures, would have beld against the publishing them in a language known to the people. The dangers as great then, as ever have been since. The greatest prudence of the Roman Church is wholly to forbid the Scriptures, being acknowledged by their wisest men, to be so contrary to their Interest. The confession of the Cardinals at Bononia, to that purpose. The avowed practice of the Roman Church herein, directly contrary to that of the Primitive: although the reasons were as great then, from the danger of Heresies. This confessed by their own Writers.

P. 55.

---

### CHAP. IV.

#### *Of the Fanaticism of the Roman Church.*

The unreasonableness of objecting Sects and Fanaticisms to us, as the effects of reading the Scriptures. Fanaticism countenanced in the Roman Church, but condemned by ours. Private revelations made among them the grounds of believing some points of doctrine; proved from their own Authors. Of the Revelations pleaded for the immaculate Conception. The

## The Contents.

*Revelation of S. Brigitt and S. Catharine directly contrary in this point, yet both owned in the Church of Rome. The large approbations of S. Brigitts, by Popes and Councils; and both their revelations acknowledged to be divine, in the lessons read upon their days. S. Catharines wonderful faculty of smelling souls, a gift peculiar to her and Philip Neri. The vain attempts of reconciling those Revelations. The great number of female Revelations approved in the Roman Church. Purgatory, Transubstantiation, Auricular Confession proved by Visions and Revelations. Festivals appointed upon the credit of Revelations: the Feast of Corpus Christi on the Revelation made to Juliana, the Story of it related from their own Writers: No such things can be objected to our Church. Revelations still owned by them; proved from the Fanatick Revelations of Mother Juliana very lately published by Mr. Cressly: Some instances of the blasphemous Non-sense contained in them. The Monastick Orders founded in Enthusiasm. An account of the great Fanaticism of S. Benedict, and S. Romoaldus: their hatred of Humane Learning, and strange Visions and Revelations. The Carthusian Order founded upon a Vision. The Carmelites Vision of their habit. The Franciscan and Dominican Orders founded on Fanaticism, and seen in a Vision of Innocent the third to be the great supporters of the Roman Church. The Quakerism of S. Francis described from their best Authors. His Ignorance, Extasies and Fanatick Preaching.*  
The

## The Contents.

*The Vision of Dominicus. The blasphemous Enthusiasm of the Mendicant Fryers. The History of it related at large. Of the Evangelium æternum, and the blasphemies contained in it. The Author of it supposed to be the General of the Franciscan Order, however owned by the Friars, and read and preached at Paris. The opposition to it by the University: but favoured by the Popes. Gul. S. Amour writing against it, his Book publicly burnt, by Order of the Court of Rome. The Popes horrible partiality to the Friars. The Fanaticism of the Franciscans afterwards. Of the followers of Petrus Johannis de Oliva. The Spiritual State began (say they) from S. Francis. The story of his wounds, and Maria Visitationis parallel'd. The canting language used by the spiritual Brethren, called Beguini, Fraticelli, and Begardi. Of their doctrines about Poverty, Swearing Perfection, the Carnal Church and Inspiration: by all which they appear to be a Sect of Quakers, after the order of St. Francis. Of the Schism made by them. The large spreading, and long continuance of them. Of the Apottolici and Dulcinista. Of their numerous Conventicles. Their high opinion of themselves. Their zeal against the Clergy, and Tithe; their doctrine of Christian Liberty. Of the Alumbardo's in Spain: their disobedience to Bishops, obstinate adhering to their own fancies, calling them Inspirations, their being above Ordinances. Ignatius Loyola suspected to be one of the Illuminati, proved from Melchior*



## The Contents.

Canus. The Jesuits Order founded in Fanaticism; a particular account of the Romanick Enthusiasm of Ignatius, from the Writers of his own Order. Whereby it is proved, that he was the greatest pretender to Enthusiasm, since the days of Mahomet and S. Francis. Ignatius gave no respect to men by words, or putting off his Hat; his great Ignorance and Preaching in the Streets: his glorying in his sufferings for it; his pretence to Mortification; the ways he used to get Disciples. Their way of resolution of difficulties by seeking God; their itinerant preaching in the Cities of Italy. The Sect of Quakers a new Order of Disciples of Ignatius, only wanting Confirmation from the Pope, which Ignatius obtained. Of the Fanatick way of devotion in the Roman Church. Of Superstitions and Enthusiastical Fanaticism among them. Of their mystical Divinity. Mr. Cressy's canting in his Preface to Sancta Sophia. Of the Deiform fund of the soul; a superessential life, and the way to it. Of contemplating with the will. Of passive Unions. The method of Self-annihilation. Of the Union of nothing with nothing. Of the feeling of not being. The mischief of an unintelligible way of devotion. The utmost effect of this way is gross Enthusiasm. Mr. Cressy's Vindication of it examined. The last sort of Fanaticism among them, resisting authority under pretence of Religion. Their principles and practices compared with the Fanaticks. How far they are disowned at present by them. Of the Vindicati-

# The Contents.

on of the Irish Remonstrance. The Court of Rome hath always favoured that party, which is most destructive to Civil Government, proved by particular and late Instances. p. 204.

---

## CHAP. V.

### *Of the Divisions of the Roman Church.*

The great pretence of Unity in the Church of Rome considered. The Popes Authority the fountain of that Unity; what that Authority is which is challenged by the Popes over the Christian World; the disturbances which have happened therein, on the account of it. The first revolt of Rome from the Empire, caused by the Popes; Baronius his Arguments answered. Rebellion the foundation of the greatness of that Church. The cause of the strict League between the Popes and the posterity of Charles Martel. The disturbances made by Popes, in the new Empire: Of the quarrels of Greg. 7. with the Emperor and other Christian Princes, upon the pretence of the Popes Authority. More disturbances on that account in Christendom, than upon any other matter of Religion. Of the Schisms which have happened in the Roman Church: particularly those after the time of Formosus, wherein his Ordinances were nulled by his Successors; the Popes opposition to each other in that Age:

## The Contents.

*Age: the miserable state of that Church then described. Of the Schisms of latter times by the Italic and Gallick Factions; the long continuance of them. The mischief of those Schisms, on their own Principles. Of the divisions in that Church, about the matters of Order and Government. The differences between the Bishops and the Monastick Orders, about exemptions and priviledges; the History of that Controversie, and the bad success the Popes had in attempting to compose it. Of the quarrel between the Regulars and Seculars in England. The continuance of that Controversie here, and in France. The Jesuites enmity to the Episcopal Order and Jurisdiction: the hard case of the Bishop of Angelopolis in America. The Popes still favour the Regulars, as much as they dare. The Jesuites way of converting the Chinese, discovered by that Bishop. Of the differences in matter of Doctrines in that Church. They have no better way to compose them than me. The Popes Authority never truly ended one Controversie among them. Their ways to evade the decisions of Popes and Councils. Their dissensions are about matters of Faith. The ways taken to excuse their own differences will as well take away those between them and us, manifested by Sancta Clara's Exposition of the 39 Articles. Their disputes not confined to their Schools, proved by a particular instance, about the immaculate conception; the infinite scandals, confessed by their own Authors, to have been in their Church about it.*

From

# The Contents.

From all which it appears, that the Church of Rome can have no advantage, in point of Unity, above ours.

P. 309.

## CHAP. VI.

### *An Answer to the Remainder of the Reply.*

The mis-interpreting Scripture doth not hinder its being a rule of faith. Of the Superstitious observations of the Roman Church. Of Indulgences; the practice of them, in what time begun; on what occasion, and in what terms granted. Of the Indulgences in Jubilees, in the Churches at Rome, and upon saying some Prayers. Instances of them produced. What opinion hath been had of Indulgences, in the Church of Rome: some confess they have no foundation in Scripture, or Antiquity; others that they are pious frauds: the miserable shifts the defenders of Indulgences were put to: plain evidences of their fraud from the Disputes of the Schools about them. The treasure of the Church invented by Aquinas, and on what occasion. The wickedness of men increased by Indulgences, acknowledged by their own Writers: and therefore condemned, by many of that Church. Of Bellarmins prudent Christians opinion of them. Indulgences no meer relaxations of Canonical Penance. The great absurdity of the doctrine of the Churches Treasure, on which Indulgences are founded,


## The Contents.

*founded, at large manifested. The tendency of them to destroy devotion, proved by experience; and the nature of the Doctrine. Of Communion in one kind; no devotion in opposing an Institution of Christ. Of the Popes power of dispensing contrary to the Law of God, in Oaths and Marriages. The ill consequence of asserting Marriage in a Priest to be worse than Fornication, which is done in the Church of Rome. Of the uncertainty of faith therein. How far revelation to be believed against sense. The arguments to prove the uncertainty of their faith defended. The case of a revolter and a bred Papist compared, as to salvation: and the greater danger of one than the other proved. The motives of the Roman Church considered; those laid down by Bishop Taylor, fully answered by himself. An account of the faith of Protestants, laid down in the way of Principles: wherein the grounds and nature of our certainty of faith are cleared. And from the whole concluded, that there can be no reasonable cause to forsake the communion of the Church of England, and to embrace that of the Church of Rome.*

P. 314.



## Two Questions proposed by one of the Church of Rome.

1.  Whether a Protestant having the  
same Motives to become a Ca-  
tholick, which one bred and  
born, and well grounded in  
the Catholick Religion, hath  
to remain in it, may not equally be saved in the  
profession of it?

2. Whether it be sufficient to be a Christian in  
the abstract, or in the whole latitude, or there  
be a necessity of being a member of some distinct  
Church, or Congregation of Christians?

An-





## Answer.



THE first *Question* being supposed to be put concerning a *Protestant* yet continuing so, doth imply a contradiction, viz. That a *Protestant* continuing so, should have the same Motives to become a *Catholick* (taking that term here only as signifying one of the communion of the *Church of Rome*) which those have, who have been born or bred in that communion. But supposing the meaning of the *Question* to be this, Whether a *Protestant* leaving the communion of our *Church*, upon the Motives used by those of the *Roman Church*, may not be equally saved with those who are bred in it? I answer,

1. That an equal capacity of salvation of those persons being supposed, can be no argument to leave the communion of a Church, wherein salvation of a person may be much more safe, than of either of them : No more, than it is, for a man to leap from the plain ground into a Ship, that is in danger of being wrackt, because he may equally hope to be saved with those who are in it. Nay, supposing an equal capacity of salvation in two several *Churches*, there

there can be no reason to forsake the communion of the one for the other. So that to persuade any one to leave our *Church* to embrace that of *Rome*, it is by no means sufficient to ask, whether such a one may not as well be saved as they that are in it already: but it is necessary, that they prove, that it is of necessity to salvation to leave our *Church*, and become a member of theirs: And when they do this, I intend to be one of their number.

2. We assert, that all those, who are in the communion of the *Church of Rome*, do run so great a hazard of their salvation, that none who have a care of their souls, ought to embrace it, or continue in it. And that upon these grounds.

1. *Because they must by the terms of communion with that Church, be guilty either of Hypocrisie or Idolatry; either of which are sins inconsistent with salvation. Which I thus prove.*

That *Church* which requires the giving the Creature the Worship due only to the Creator, makes the members of it guilty of Hypocrisie or Idolatry: For if they do it, they are guilty of the latter; if they do it not, of the former: But the *Church of Rome in the Worship of God by Images, the Adoration of the Bread in the Eucharist, and the formal Invocation of Saints*, doth require the giving to the Creature the Worship due only to the Creator: Therefore it makes the members of it guilty of Hypocrisie or Idolatry.

That the *Church of Rome*, in these particulars, doth require the giving the Creature the honor

honor due only to *God*, I prove thus concerning each of them.

1. Where the Worship of *God* is terminated upon a Creature, there, by their own confession, the Worship due only to *God* is given to the Creature; but in the Worship of *God* by Images, the Worship due to *God* is terminated wholly on the Creature; which is thus proved; the Worship which *God* himself denies to receive, must be terminated on the Creature, but *God* himself, in the *Second Commandment* not only denies to receive it, but threatens severely to punish them that give it. Therefore it cannot be terminated on *God*, but only on the Image.

2. The same Argument which would make the grossest Heathen Idolatry Lawful, cannot excuse any act from Idolatry; but the same Argument, whereby the *Papists* make the Worship of the Bread in the *Eucharist* not to be Idolatry, would make the grossest Heathen Idolatry not to be so. For if it be not therefore Idolatry, because they suppose the bread to be *God*, then the Worship of the Sun was not Idolatry in them who supposed the Sun to be *God*; and upon this ground, the grosser the Idolatry was, the less it was Idolatry: for the grossest Idolaters were those, who supposed their Statues to be *Gods*. And upon this ground their Worship was more lawful, than of those, who supposed them not to be so.

3. If the supposition of a middle excellency between *God* and us, be a sufficient ground for formal Invocation, then the Heathen Worship  
of

of their inferiour Deities could be no Idolatry: for the Heathens still pretended, that they did not give to them the Worship proper to the Supream God; which is as much as is pretended by the devoutest Papist, in justification of the *Invocation of Saints*. To these I expect a direct and punctual answer, professing as much Charity towards them, as is consistent with Scripture and Reason.

2. *Because the Church of Rome is guilty of so great corruption of the Christian Religion by such opinions and practices which are very apt to hinder a good life:* Such are, the destroying the necessity of a good life, by making the Sacrament of Penance joyned with contrition, sufficient for salvation; the taking off the care of it, by supposing an expiation of sin (by the prayers of the living) after death. And the sincerity of devotion is much obstructed in it; by prayers in a language which many understand not; by making the efficacy of Sacraments depend upon the bare administration, whether our minds be prepared for them or not; by discouraging the reading the Scripture, which is our most certain rule of faith and life; by the multitude of superstitious observacions, never used in the Primitive Church, as we are ready to defend; by the gross abuse of people in Pardons and Indulgences; by denying the Cup to the Laity, contrary to the practice of the Church in the solemn Celebration of the Eucharist, for a thousand years after Christ; by making it in the power of any person to dispense, contrary to the Law of God, in Oaths and Marriages; by making disobedience to the

D

the

*the Church, in disputable matters, more baineous than disobedience to the Laws of Christ, in unquestionable things; as Marriage in a Priest, to be a greater crime, than Fornication.*

By all which practices, and opinions we assert, that there are so many hinderances to a good life, that none who have a care of their salvation, can venture their souls, in the communion of such a *Church*, which either enjoins or publickly allows them.

3. *Because it exposeth the faith of Christians, to so great uncertainty: By making the Authority of the Scriptures to depend on the Infallibility of the Church, when the Churches Infallibility must be proved by the Scripture: by making those things necessary to be believed, which if they be believed overthrow all foundations of faith, viz. That we are not to believe our senses, in the plainest objects of them; as, that bread which we see is not bread, upon which it follows, that tradition being a continued kind of sensation, can be no more certain, than sense it self; and that the Apostles might have been deceived in the body of Christ after the resurrection; and the Church of any Age, in what they saw or heard. By denying to men the use of their judgment and reason, as to the matters of faith proposed by a Church, when they must use it in the choice of a Church; by making the Churches power extend to make new Articles of faith,*  
*viz.*

viz. by making those things necessary to be believed, which were not so before. By pretending to infallibility, in determining Controversies; and yet not determining Controversies, which are on foot among themselves. All which, and several other things, which my designed brevity will not permit me to mention, tend very much to shake the faith of such, who have nothing else to rely on, but the authority of the Church of Rome.

3. I answer, That a Protestant leaving the Communion of our Church, doth incur a greater guilt, than one who was bred up in the communion of the Church of Rome, and continues therein by invincible ignorance; and therefore cannot equally be saved with such a one. For a Protestant is supposed, to have sufficient convictions of the Errours of the Roman Church, or is guilty of wilful ignorance, if he hath not; but although we know not, what allowances God will make for invincible ignorance, we are sure that wilful ignorance, or choosing a worse Church before a better, is a damnable sin, and unrepented of destroys salvation.

To the second Question I answer, 1. I do not understand what is meant by a Christian in the Abstract, or in the whole latitude; it being a thing I never heard, or read of before: and therefore may have some meaning in it, which I cannot understand. 2. But if the Question be, as the



last words imply it, whether a *Christian* by vertue of his being so, be bound to joyn in some *Church* or *Congregation* of *Christians*? I answer affirmatively; and that he is bound to choose the communion of the purest *Church*, and not to leave that for a corrupt one, though called never so *Catholick*.

---

*The*

---

## The Proposer's of the Questions Reply to the Answer.

Madam,

**I** Did not expect that two bare Questions could have produced such a super-saturation of Controversies, as the Paper you sent me is fraught with; But since the Answerer hath been pleased to take this Method, (for what end himself best knows) I shall not refuse to give a fair and plain return, to the several points he insists upon, and that with as much brevity, as the matter and circumstances will bear.

The Questions proposed were: 1. Whether a Protestant having the same Motives to become a Catholick, which one bred and born, and well grounded in Catholick Religion hath to remain in it, may not equally be saved in the profession of it?

The 2. Whether it be sufficient to be a Christian in the abstract, or in the whole latitude, or there be a necessity of being a member of some distinct Church or Congregation of Christians?

The first, he saith, being supposed to be put concerning a Protestant continuing so, implys a contraction; but where it lies I cannot see; for a Protestant may have the same Motives, and

yet out of wilfulness or passion not acquiesce to them. He saw no doubt this supposition to be impertinent to the Question, and therefore in the second part of the 1. §. states it thus: Whether a Protestant leaving the communion of the Protestant Church, upon the motives used by those of the Roman Church, may not be equally saved with those who were bred in it.

The Question thus stated, in its true supposition, he answers first, §. 2. That an equal capacity of salvation of those persons being supposed, can be no argument to leave the Communion of a Church, wherein the salvation of a person may be much more safe than either of them. But before I reply, I must do both him and my self right in matter of fact; and it is, Madam, that when you first addressed to me, you professed your self much troubled, that he had told you, a person leaving the Protestant communion, and embracing the Catholick, could not be saved. That we should deny salvation to any out of the Catholick Church, you lookt upon as uncharitable, and this assertion of his had startled you in the opinion you had before of the Protestant Charity. Whereupon you desired to know my opinion in the case, and I told you I saw no reason, why the same Motives which secured one born and bred, and well grounded in the Catholick Religion, to continue in it, were not sufficient also to secure a Protestant, who convinced by them, should embrace it. This, Madam, your self can witness, was the true occasion of your proposing the Question, and not as the Answerer supposes, that I used the meer question it self as a sufficient Argument

gument to perswade you to embrace the Catholick Communion. This premised, I reply; that the Answer he gives, is altogether forsign to the matter in hand, the Controversie not being between a Bred and a Converted Catholick on the one side, and a person supposed to be in a safer Church than either of them on the other: nor yet between two several Churches, supposed to have in them an equal Capacity of salvation; but between a person bred in the Catholick Religion on the one side, and another converted to it from Protestantism on the other, whether the latter may not be equally saved with the former? Nor is it to the purpose of the present Question, to prove that it is of necessity to salvation to leave the Protestant Church, and become a member of the Catholick; because the Question is only of the possibility, not of the necessity of Salvation. I say, it is not necessary, to the present Question, to prove this; but rather belongs to the second, where I shall speak to it. Whether there be a necessity of being a member of some distinct Church? Which being resolved affirmatively by both parts, it follows then in order to inquire which this true Church is. As for the Example of a man leaping from the plain ground into a Ship that is in danger of being wrackt, meaning by that Ship (as I suppose he does) the Catholick Church. Some will be apt to think he had come nearer the Mark if he had compared the Protestant to a Ship, which by often knocking against the Rock on which the Catholick Church is built, had split it self into innumerable Sects; and was now in danger of sinking: his comparison was

grounded only on his own supposition, but this is grounded on the truth it self of too sad an experience. But to leave words, and come to the matter. His second Answer is, §. 3. that all those, who are in the communion of the Church of Rome, do run so great a hazard of their Salvation, that none who have a care of their souls ought to embrace or continue in it. The first answer, as I have shewed, was nothing pertinent to the present Question; nor comes this second, any nearer the matter; for though it be supposed, that none ought to embrace or continue in the Catholick Church, by reason of the great hazard, he saith, they run of their salvation, yet if they do embrace or continue in it, why may they not be equally saved, that is, with equal capacity? but this assertion, however beside the Question, he makes it his main business to prove, First, §. 4. Because those who embrace, or continue in the Catholick Church, are guilty either of Hypocrisie, or Idolatry; either of which, are sins inconsistent with salvation. And here he must give me leave to return upon him a more palpable contradiction, than that he supposed to have found in the Question, viz. to assert only, that those of the Catholick Communion run a great hazard of their salvation, and yet affirm at the same time that they are guilty either of Hypocrisie, or Idolatry, sins inconsistent with Salvation: which reduced into plain terms is no other, but that they may be saved, though hardly; and yet cannot be saved. But to the Argument; The Church of Rome, by the Worship of God by Images, by the adoration of Bread in the Eucharist, and

and the formal invocation of Saints, doth require the giving to the Creature the Worship due only to the Creator; Therefore it makes the members of it guilty of Hypocrisie or Idolatry. *The charge is great, but what are the proofs?*

*Concerning the first he saith, §. 5. that in the Worship of God by Images, the Worship due to God is terminated wholly on the Creature. And surely this implies another contradiction, that it should be the Worship of God by Images, and yet be terminated wholly on the Creature; Nevertheless he proves it thus: The Worship which God himself denies to receive, must be terminated upon the Creature; but God himself in the second Commandment, not only denies to receive it, but threatens severely to punish them that give it, that is, that Worship him by an Image: Therefore it cannot be terminated on God, but only on the Image. To this Argument, which to be just to the Author, I confess I have not seen any where proposed in these terms, I answer, the first Proposition is built on a great mistake of the Nature of humane acts, which though they ought to be governed by the Law of God, yet when they swerve from it, cease not to tend to their own proper objects. Gods prohibition of such or such a kind of Worship, may make it to be unlawful, but hinders not the act from tending, whither it is intended; and consequently if it be intended or directed by the understanding to God, though after an unlawful manner, it will not fail to be terminated upon God: Thus, when a Thief or a Murderer prays to God, to give him good success in the Theft or Murder he intends; though God denies*



denyes to bear any such Prayer, yet is the Prayer truly directed to him: and thus when the Jews offered to God in Sacrifice the blind and the lame, though he had forbidden it, yet was the oblation terminated on him, and therefore he reproves them for having polluted him, Mal. 1. 8. and to convince them the more of their evil doings, offer it now, says he, to thy Governour, will he be pleased with thee, or accept thy person? Though the Governour deny to accept what is presented to him, yet it is truly offered to him by the presenter: and so, although God deny to accept such or such Sacrifice, yet it is truly offered to him; though the offering of it, after a forbidden manner, make it to be sin: Did not God refuse to accept the Sacrifice of Cain, and yet the Scripture, Gen. 4. 3. says expressly, that he brought an offering to the Lord? God had not respect to Cain nor his offering, but this did not hinder, but that Cains offering had respect to God, and was terminated on him. In like manner, though God deny such or such a kind of Worship; if it be offered, though unlawfully, by the Creature yet is it terminated on him. The Proposition therefore which asserts, that the worship which God denyes must be terminated on the Creature, I deny as absolutely false, and so will you too, Madam, when you shall see the sense of it to be no other, but that a wicked man cannot Pray to God, or Worship him in an unlawful or forbidden manner, who is therefore a wicked man because he does so. What follows from hence is, that though God should have forbidden men to Worship him by Images, yet it does not follow but the Worship so given, would be terminated on him. But now

to speak to his second Proposition in which the main force of this Argument consists.

We utterly deny that God in the second Commandment, forbids himself to be Worshipped by a Crucifix, for example, or such like Sacred Image; for such only are the subject of the present Controversie. What he forbids there, is to give his Worship to Idols: and this is clear from the Circumstances of the Text: First, Because this Commandment, if St. Austins Judgement be to be followed, is but a part or Explication of the first, Thou shalt have no other Gods before me: Secondly, because the Hebrew word *Pesel*, in Latine Sculptile, is used in Scripture to signifie an Idol: Let them be confounded who adore Sculptilia, that is, Idols, saith the Psalmist; and so the Septuagint translate it in this very place *ἰδωλον*, an Idol, Thou shalt not make to thy self and Idol; so that it was an artifice of the Protestants, to make their assertion seem plausible, to translate Image instead of Idol; and not a certain kind of Image neither, but any whatsoever. Thou shalt not make to thy self any graven Image. Now what is all this to Catholicks, who neither make to themselves, nor adore Idols, nor yield Sovereign honour or acknowledgement of Deity to any but God? We give indeed a veneration to Images, but the Image of God is not another God besides him; nor is the Worship of it, the Worship of another God, but of him who is represented by it: for St. Basil saith, The Worship of an Image has not there, but is referred or carryed to the prototype, or thing represented.

Ep. 17. ad  
Marcel. am.

We give therefore an inferiour, or relative honour only to the Sacred Images of Christ, and his blessed Mother, and Saints; not latriam, the Worship due to God, but Honorariam adorationem, a certain honorary Worship, expressed by kissing them, or putting off our Hats, or kneeling before them, much like the Worship given to the Chair of State, or the Kings Picture, or his Garment by the like actions: or to come nearer to the Subject such as was commanded to be given to Moses and Joshua to the ground whereon they stood, by putting off their Shoes, because it was holy, and by the Jews, in adoring the footstool of God, or falling down before it, Psal. 98. 5. and in Worshipping (as St. Jerom testifies they did) that part of the Temple called the Holy of Holies, because there were the Cherubims (Sacred Images ordered by God himself to be placed there) the propitiatory (representing Gods Throne) and the Ark, (his footstool) In a word, such as the Protestants themselves give to the Name of Jesus, when they hear it spoken, by putting off their Hats, and bowing at it; or to the Elements of Bread and Wine in the Supper, by kneeling before them, as figures representing the death of Christ. If condescendence to the conscience of weaker Brethren, will permit to own they have any honour or veneration for them, or for the Altar before which they bow. To conclude this point; the Objector brings a Text, which forbids us to give the Sovereign honour due to God, to an Idol; but let us hear out of Scripture an express Text that it is not lawful to give to holy Images, and other things relating to God, an inferiour or relative Worship,

Worship, such as we have declared, and that will be to the purpose.

§. He aims to conclude the Catholick Church guilty of Idolatry, from the adoration of the bread (as he believes it) in the Eucharist. Now to do this, he ought to prove, that what we adore in the Eucharist, is bread indeed. But instead of that, he brings a comparison between our adoration of Christ in the Eucharist, and the Heathens adoration of the Sun: viz. That the Papists by the same Argument, make the Worship of the bread in the Eucharist not to be Idolatry, which would excuse the Heathens Worship of the Sun, and of their Statues from Idolatry; For if it be not therefore Idolatry, says he, because they suppose the bread to be God, then the Worship of the Sun was not Idolatry in them, who supposed the Sun to be God, I shall not complain here of the unhandsoness of the expression, that Catholicks suppose the bread to be God, just as the Heathens supposed the Sun to be God: whereas he knows, that the Catholicks believe, that the substance of the bread is changed into Christs body; but shall answer to the Argument, That the Worship of Christ in the Eucharist, is not Idolatry, because we only suppose him to be really present under the form of bread, but because we know and believe this upon the same grounds and Motives upon which we believe (and those Motives stronger than any Protestant hath (if he have no other than the Catholick) to believe) that Christ is God, and consequently to be adored. And therefore that you may the better see the inefficaciousness of the Argument, suppose it drops

dropt from the Pen of an Arrian against the adoration of Christ as God, and it will be of as much force to evince that to be Idolatry, as it is from the Objection to prove the adoration of him in the Eucharist to be so; see there how an Arrian might argue in the same form. The same Argument which would make the grossest Heathen Idolatry lawful, cannot excuse any act from Idolatry: but the same argument, whereby the Protestants make the Worship of Christ (a pure man, says the Arrian) not to be Idolatry: would make the grossest Heathen Idolatry not to be so: For if it be not therefore Idolatry, because they suppose Christ to be God, then the Worship of the Sun was not Idolatry, by them who supposed the Sun to be God, &c. Now the same answer which solves the Arrians arguments against the adoration of Christ as God, serves no less to solve the Objectors Argument against the adoration of him in the Eucharist, since we have a like Divine Revelation for his real presence under the Sacramental Signs, as we have for his being true God and Man.

But what if Catholicks should be mistaken in their belief? would it then follow, that they were Idolaters? Dr. Taylor, an Eminent and leading man amongst the Protestants, denies the consequence. His words are these, in the Liberty of Prophecyng, Sect. 20. Numb. 26. Idolatry, says he, is a forsaking the true God, and giving Divine Worship to a Creature, or to an Idol, that is, to an Imaginary God, who hath no foundation in Essence or Existence: And this is that kind of superstition, which by Divines is called the superstition of an undue object:

Now

Now it is evident, that the object of their (that is, the Catholicks) adoration (that which is represented to them in their minds, their thoughts and purposes, and by which God principally, if not solely, takes estimate of humane actions) in the blessed Sacrament, is the only true and eternal God, hypostatically joyned with his holy humanity, which humanity they believe actually present under the Veil of the Sacramental Signs; and if they thought him not present, they are so far from worshipping the bread in this case, that themselves profess it Idolatry to do so; which is a demonstration (*mark that*) that their soul hath nothing in it, that is Idolatrical. If their confidence and fanciful opinion (so he terms the faith of Catholicks) hath engaged them upon so great a mistake (as without doubt, he says, it hath) yet the will hath nothing in it, but what is a great enemy to Idolatry. *Et nihil ardet in inferno nisi propria voluntas*; that is, Nothing burns in Hell, but proper Will. Thus Dr. Taylor; and I think it will be a task worthy the Objectors pains, to solve his Argument, if he will not absolve us from being Idolaters.

§. 7. He proceeds to prove, that Catholicks are guilty of Idolatry, by their Invocation of Saints: And his Argument is this; If the supposition of a middle excellency between God and us, be a sufficient ground for formal Invocation, then the Heathens Worship of their inferiour Deities, could be no Idolatry, for the Heathens still pretended, that they did not give to them the Worship proper to the Supreme



Supream God; which is as much as is pretended by the devoutest Papists in Justification of the Invocation of Saints. To answer this Argument, I shall need little more than to explicate the hard words in it; which thus I do. By persons of a middle excellency, we understand persons endowed with supernatural gifts of Grace in this life, and Glory in Heaven, whose prayers by consequence are acceptable and available with God; what he means by formal Invocation, I understand not well: but what we understand by it, is desiring or praying those just persons to pray for us. The Supream Deity of the Heathens is known to be Jupiter, and their inferiour Deities, Venus, Mars, Bacchus, Vulcan, and the like rabble of Devils, as the Scripture calls them, The gods of the Heathens are Devils. The terms thus explicated, 'tis easie to see the inconsequence of the Argument, that because the Heathens were Idolaters in worshipping Mars and Venus, their inferiour Deities, or rather Devils, though they pretended not to give them the Worship proper to Jupiter their Supream God: Therefore the Catholicks, must be guilty of Idolatry, in desiring the servants of the true God, to pray for them to him; upon this account we must not desire the prayer of a just man, even in this life, because this formal Invocation will be to make him an inferiour Deity.

But if some Sect of Heathens, as the Platonists, did attain to the knowledge of the true God, yet St. Paul says, they did not glorifie him as God; but changed his glory into an Image made like to corruptible man, adoring and offering Sacrifice

due

due to God alone, to the Statues themselves, or the inferior Heities they supposed to dwell or assist in them. Which inferior Deities S. Austin upon the ninety sixth Psalm, proves to be Devils or evil Angels, because they required Sacrifice to be offered to them, and would be worshipped as Gods. Now what comparison there is between this worship of the Heathens inferior Deities, and Christians worship of Saints and Angels, let the same S. Austin declare in his twentieth Book against Faustus the Manichæan, chap. 21. Faustus there calumniates the Catholicks (the word is S. Austins) because they honored the Memories or Shrines of Martyrs, charging them to have turned the Idols into Martyrs, whom they worship (said he) with like Vows. The Objection you see it not new, that Catholicks make inferior Deities of their Saints. Faustus long ago made it, and S. Austins Answer will serve as well now as then. Christian people, says he, do with Religious Solemnity celebrate the memory of Martyrs, both to excite to the imitation of them, and to become partakers of their Merits, and be holpen by their prayers, but to that we erect Altars, not to any of the Martyrs, but to the God of Martyrs, although in memory of the said Martyrs; for what Bishop officiating at the Altar, in the places where their holy bodies are deposited, does say at any time; we offer to thee Peter, or Paul, or Cyprian? but what is offered to God, who crown'd the Martyrs; at the Memories or Shrines of those whom he crown'd; that being put in mind by the very places, a greater affection may

may be raised in us to quicken our love, both to those whom we may imitate, and towards him by whose assistance we can do it. We worship therefore the Martyrs with that Worship of love and society, with which even in this life also holy men of God are Worthipped, whose heart we judge prepared to suffer the like Martyrdom for the truth of the Gospel. But we worship *them* so much the more devoutly, because more securely, after they have overcome all the Incertainties of this world ; as also we praise them more confidently, now reigning Conquerors in a more happy life, than whilst they were fighting in this ; but with that Worship, which in Greek is called *Latria* ( and cannot be expressed by one word in Latin ) for as much as it is a certain service properly due to the Divinity, we neither worship them, nor teach them to be worshipped, but God alone. Now whereas the offering of Sacrifice belongs to this Worship ( of *Latria* ) from whence they are called Idolaters, who gave it also to Idols, by no means do we suffer any such thing, or command it to be offered, to any Martyr, or any holy soul, or any Angel : And whosoever declines into this Error, we reprove him by sound Doctrine, either that he may be corrected, or avoided —

*And a little after.* It is a much less sin, for a man to be derided by the Martyrs for drunkenness, then ever failing to offer Sacrifice to them. I say to sacrifice to Martyrs, I say not to sacrifice to God in the memories ( or Churches ) of the Martyrs, which we do most frequently

quently, by that rite alone, by which in the manifestation of the New Testament he hath commanded Sacrifice to be offered to him, which belongs to that Worship, which is called *Latria*, and is due only to God. *This was the Doctrine and practice of Christian people in S. Augustines time, and that he himself held formal Invocations a part of the Worship due to Saints, is evident from the prayer he made to S. Cyprian after his Martyrdom. Adjuvetq; nos Beatus Cyprianus orationibus suis; &c.* Let Blessed Cyprian therefore help us, who are still encompassed with this mortal flesh, and labour as in a dark cloud) with his prayer, that by Gods grace we may, as far as we are able, imitate his good works. Thus S. Austin, where you see he directs his prayers to S. Cyprian, which I take to be formal Invocation; and for a further confirmation of it, we have the ingenuous Confession of Calvin himself, Instit. l. 3. c. 20 n. 22. where speaking of the third Council of Carthage, in which St. Austin was present, he acknowledged it was the custom at that time to say, Sancta Maria, aut Sancte Petre Ora pro nobis; Holy Mary, or holy Peter pray for us.

But now, Madam, what if after all this, he himself shall deny, that any of the opposite Tenets are Articles of his faith; viz. That honor is not to be given to the Images of Christ and his Saints, that what appears to be bread in the Eucharist, is not the body of Christ: That it is not lawful to invoke the Saints to pray for us. Press him close, and I believe you shall find him deny, that he believes any one of these Nega-

tive points to be Divine truths; and if so, you will easily see his charge of Idolatry against us, to be vain and groundless.

Having thus given a direct and punctual answer to his Argument, I must now expect as much charity from him, as is consistent with Scripture and Reason. How much that is, you will see in his third Answer to the first Question. But to proceed.

6. 8. He brings a Miscellany of such opinions and practices (as he calls them) which are very apt to hinder a good life; and therefore none who have a care of their salvation, can venture their souls in the communion of such a Church, which either enjoyns, or publickly allows them, He reckons up no less than ten.

1. That we destroy the necessity of good life, by making the Sacrament of Penance (that is, Confession and Absolution) joyned with contrition, sufficient for salvation. And do not Protestants make contrition alone, which is less, sufficient for salvation? But perhaps the joyning of confession and absolution with contrition, makes it of a malignant nature: If so, certainly when the Book of Common Prayer in the visitation of the sick, enjoyns the sick man, if he find his conscience troubled with any weighty matter, to make a special confession, and receive absolution from the Priest in the same words the Catholick Church uses, it prescribes him, that as a means to prepare himself for a holy death, which in the judgement of the Objector, destroys the necessity of good life.

2. Catholicks, he says, take off the care of good life, by supposing an expiation of sin (by the prayer of the living) after death: But certainly the belief of temporal pains to be sustained after death, if there be not a perfect expiation of sin in this life, by works of penance, is rather apt to make a man careful not to commit the least sin, than to take off the care of a good life. And though he be assured by faith, that he may be holpen by the charitable suffrages of the faithful living, yet this is no more encouragement to him to sin, than it would be to a Spendthrift to run into debt, and be cast into Prison, because he knows he may be relieved by the charity of his Friends. If he were sure there were no Prison for him, that would be an encouragement indeed to play the Spendthrift. And this is the case of the Protestants in their denial of Purgatory.

3. The sincerity of Devotion, he says, is much obstructed, by prayers in a language which many understand not. If he speak of private prayers, all Catholicks are taught to say them in their Mother Tongue: If of the publick prayers of the Church, I understand not why it may not be done with as much sincerity of devotion, the people joining their intention and particular prayers with the Priest, as their Embassador to God, as if they understood him: I am sure the effects of sincere devotion, for nine hundred years together which this manner of Worship produced in this Nation, were much different from those we have seen since the reducing of the publick Lyturgie into English, as is manifest from those Monuments,



which yet remain of Churches, Colledges, Religious Houses, &c. with their endowments, and in the conversion of many Nations from Heathenism to Christianity, effected by the labours and zeal of English Missionaries in those times, &c. But this is a matter of Discipline, and so not to be regulated by the fancies of private men, but the judgment of the Church, and so universal hath this practice been both in the Primitive Greek and Latin Churches, and is still (by the confession of the (Protestant) Authors themselves of the Bible of many Languages, Printed at London, Anno, 1655.) in most of the Sects of Christians, to have not only the Scriptures, but also the Liturgies and Rituals in a Tongue unknown, but to the Learned among them: that who will dispute against it, must prepare himself to bear the censure of S. Austin. Ep. 118. where he saith, That it is a point of most insolent madness, to dispute whether that be to be observed, which is frequented by the whole Church through the world.

4. He says, The sincerity of Devotion is much obstructed, by making the efficacy of Sacraments depend upon the bare Administration, whether our minds be prepared for them or not. In what Council this Doctrine was defined, I never read; but as for the Sacraments of Penance, which I suppose he chiefly aims at, I read in the council of Trent, Sess. 14. *Falso quidam calumniantur*, That some do falsely calumniate Catholick Writers, as if they taught the Sacrament of Penance did confer Grace without

without the good motion of the receiver, which the Church of God never taught nor thought. But I am rather inclined to look upon this as a mistake, than a calumny in the Objector.

5. He says, The sincerity of Devotion is much obstructed by discouraging the reading of Scriptures, which is our most certain rule of Faith and Life. Here he calls the Churches prudential dispensing the reading of Scripture to persons, whom she judges fit and disposed for it, and not to such whom she judges in a condition to receive, or do harm by it, a discouraging the reading of the Scriptures; which is no other than whereas S. Paul. Coloss. 3. 21. enjoyns Fathers not to provoke their children, lest they be discouraged; one should reprove a Father for discouraging his child, because he will not put a knife or sword into his hands, when he foresees he will do mischief with it to himself or others; the Scriptures in the hands of a meek and humble soul, who submits its judgement in the interpretation of it to that of the Church, is a Sword to defend it: but in the hands of an arrogant and presumptuous Spirit, that hath no Guide to interpret it, but its own fancy or passion, it is a dangerous weapon, with which he will wound both himself and others. The first that permitted promiscuous reading of Scripture in our Nation, was King Henry the eighth; and many years were not passed, but he found the ill consequences of it, for in a Book set forth by him in the year, 1542. he complains in the Preface, That he found entred into some of his peoples hearts an

inclination to sinister understanding of it, presumption, arrogance, carnal liberty and contention: which he compares to the seven worse Spirits in the Gospel, with which the Devil entred into the house that was purged and cleansed. Whereupon he declares that for that part of the Church ordained to be taught (that is, the Lay people) it ought not to be denied certainly, that the reading of the Old and New Testament is not so necessary for all those folks, that of duty they ought and be bound to read it; but as the Prince and Policy of the Realm shall think convenient, so to be tolerated or taken from it. Consonant whereunto, *saieth he*, the Politick Law of our Realm, hath now restrained it from a great many. *This was the judgment of him, who first took upon him the Title of Head of the Church of England; and if that ought not to have been followed in after times, let the dire effects of so many new Sects and Phantasies, as have risen in England from the reading of it, bear witness.* For as S. Austin says, *Neque enim natæ sunt Hæreses; Heresies have no other Origen but hence*, that the Scriptures which in themselves are good, are not well understood, and what is understood amiss in them, is rashly and boldly asserted, viz. to be the sense of them. *And now whether the Scriptures left to the private interpretation of every fanciful Spirit, as it is among Protestants, be a most certain Rule of Faith and Life, I leave to your self to judge.*

Tract. 18.  
in Job.

6. He says, The sincerity of devotion is much obstructed by the multitude of superstitious obler-

observations never used in the Primitive Church, as he is ready to defend, *he should have said to prove; for we deny any such to be used in the Church.*

7. By the gross abuse of people in Pardons and Indulgencies. Against this I can assert as an eye-witness, the great devotion caused by the wholesome use of Indulgences in Catholick Countrys: there being no Indulgence ordinarily granted, but enjoyns him that will avail himself of it; to confess his sins, to receive the Sacraments, to pray, fast, and give alms, all which duties are with great devotion performed by Catholick people, which without the incitement of an Indulgence, had possibly been left undone.

8. He says, The sincerity of devotion is much obstructed, by denying the Cup to the Laity, contrary to the practice of the Church in the solemn celebration of the Eucharist for a thousand years after Christ. This thousand years after Christ makes a great noise, as if it were not as much in the power of the Church a thousand years after Christ, as well as in the first or second Century, to alter and change things of their own nature indifferent; such as the communicating under one or both kinds, was ever held to be by Catholicks. But although the Cup were not then denied to the Laity, yet that the custom of receiving but under one kind was permitted, even in the primitive Church, in private communions, the Objector seems to grant, because he speaks only of the Administration of it in the solemn Celebration; and that it was also in use in publick Communions, is evident from Examples  
of

Sozomen. li.  
 & Hist. c. 5.  
 & Niceph.  
 l. 13. c. 11.  
 S. Leo. Ser.  
 4. de Quad.

of that time, both in the Greek Church, in the time of S. Chrysostome; and of the Latin, in the time of S. Leo the great. As for the pretended obstruction of Devotion, you must know Catholics believe that under either species or kind, whole Christ true God and man is contained and received; and if it be accounted an hindrance to devotion to receive the total refection of our soul, though but under one kind, what must it be to believe that I receive him under neither, but instead of him have Elements of Bread and Wine? Surely nothing can be more efficacious to stir up reverence and devotion in us, than to believe, that God himself will personally enter under our Roof.

The ninth Hindrance of the sincerity of devotion is, that we make it in the power of a person to dispense in Oaths and Marriages contrary to the Law of God. To this I answer, That some kind of Oaths, the condition of the person and other circumstances considered, may be judged to be hurtful, and not fit to be kept, and the dispensation in them is, no more than to judge on determine them to be so: and consequently to do this cannot be a hinderance, but a furtherance to Devotion, nor is it contrary to the Law of God, which commands nothing that's hurtful to be done. As for Marriages, we acknowledge the Church may dispense, in some degrees of Consanguinity and Affinity, but in nothing contrary to the Law of God.

His tenth pretended Obstruction of Devotion is, that we make disobedience to the Church in disputable matters, more hainous than disobedience to Christ in unquestionable things,

as Marriage, be saith, in a Priest to be a greater crime than Fornication. I Answer, That whether a Priest may marry or no (supposing the Law of the Church forbidding it) is not a disputable matter; but 'tis out of Question, even by the Law of God, that Obedience is to be given to the Commands or Prohibitions of the Church: The Antithesis therefore between disobedience to the Church, in disputable matters, and disobedience to the Laws of Christ in unquestionable things, is not only impertinent to the Marriage of Priests which is unquestionably forbidden; but, supposing the matter to remain disputable after the Churches Prohibition, destroys all obedience to the Church. But if it suppose them only disputable before; then why may not the Church interpose her judgment, and put them out of dispute?

But still it seems strange to them, who either cannot or will not take the Word of Christ, that in his Counsel of Chastity, that Marriage in a Priest should be a greater sin than Fornication. But he considers not, that though Marriage in itself be honorable, yet, if it be prohibited to a certain order of persons, by the Church to whom Christ himself commands us to give obedience, and they oblige themselves by a voluntary vow to live in perpetual Chastity, the Law of God commanding us to pay our Vows, it loses its honor in such persons, and if contracted after such vow made, is in the language of the Fathers no better than Adultery. In the primitive Church it was the custom of some Younger Widows to dedicate themselves to the Service of the Church, and

in



in order thereunto to take upon them a peculiar habit, and make a vow of continency for the future. Now in case they married after this, S. Paul himself, 1 Tim. 1. 12. saith, That they incurred Damnation, because by so doing, they made void their first faith, that is, as the Fathers Expound it, the vow they had made. And the fourth Council of Carthage, in which were 214 Bishops, and among them S. Austin gives the reason in these words; If Wives who commit Adultery are guilty to their Husbands, how much more shall such Widdows, as change their Religious state, be noted with the crime of Adultery? And if this were so in Widdows, much more in Priests, if by marrying they shall make void their first Faith given to God, when they were consecrated in a more peculiar manner to his Service.

Thus much may suffice for Answer to the Argument, which with its intricate terms may seem to puzzle an unlearned Reader; let us now speak a word to the true state of the Controversie, which is, whether Marriage or single life in a Priest be more apt to obstruct or further devotion. And S. Paul himself hath determined the Question, 1 Cor. 7. 32. where he saith, He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to our Lord, how he may please our Lord; But he that is married careth for the things that are of the World, how he may please his Wife. This is the difference he putteth between the married and single life, that this is apt to make us care for the things which belong to God; and that to divert our thoughts from him to the things

things of the World. Judge therefore which of these states is most convenient for Priests; whose proper office it is to attend wholly to the things of God?

Having thus cleared Catholick Doctrines, from being any ways obstructive to good life or devotion, I shall proceed to his third Argument, by which he will still prove that Catholicks run a great hazard of their souls, in adhering to the Communion of the Church of Rome, Because it exposeth the Faith of Christians to so great uncertainty. This is a strange charge from the pen of a Protestant, who hath no other certainty for his faith but every mans Interpretation of the Letter of the Scriptures. But, first he saith it doth this, By making the Authority of the Scriptures to depend upon the infallibility of the Church, when the Churches infallibility must be proved by the Scriptures.

To this I answer, That the Authority of the Scriptures not in it self, for so it hath its Authority from God; but in order to us and our belief of it, depends upon the infallibility of the Church. And therefore S. Austin saith of himself, That he would not believe the Gospel, unless the Authority of the Catholick Church did move him. And if you ask him what moved him to submit to that Authority; he tells you, That besides the Wisdom he found in the Tenets of the Church, there were many other things which most justly held him in it: as the consent of people and Nations, an Authority begun by Miracles, nourished by Hope, increased by Charity, and established by Antiquity, the suc-

succession of Priests, from the very Seat of S. Peter, to whom our Lord commended the feeding of his Sheep, unto the present Bishoprick. Lastly, The very name of Catholick which this Church alone, among so many Heresies hath not without cause obtained so particularly to her self; that whereas all Hereticks would be called Catholicks, yet if a stranger demand where the Catholicks go to Church, none of these Hereticks dares to shew either his own house or Church. These (*said* S. Austin) so many and great, most dear bonds of the name of Christians, do justly hold a believing man in the Catholick Church. *These were the grounds which moved that great man to submit to her Authority: And when Catholick Authors prove the infallibility of the Church from Scriptures, 'tis an Argument ad hominem to convince Protestants who will admit nothing but Scripture, and yet when they are convinced, quarrel at them as illogical disputants, because they prove it from Scripture.*

*Next he saith we overthrow all foundation of Faith, because We will not believe our senses in the plainest objects of them. But what if God have interposed his Authority, as he hath done in the case of the Eucharist, where he tells us, that it is his Body, must we believe our senses rather than God? or must we not believe them in other things, because in the particular case of the Eucharist we must believe God, rather than our senses? Both these consequences you see are absurd: Now for the case it self, in which he instances, Dr. Taylor above cited confesser, that they*  
*(viz.*

(viz. *Catholicks*) have a Divine Revelation (viz. *Christs word, This is my Body*) whose Literal and Grammatical sense, if that sense were intended, would warrant them to do violence to all the Sciences in the Circle; but, I add, it would be no president to them not to believe their senses, in other the plainest objects of them, as in the matter of Tradition, or Christs Body after the Resurrection.

3. He saith that We expose faith to great uncertainty, by denying to men the use of their judgement and reason; as to the matters of faith proposed by a Church, that is, we deny particular mens Judgement, as to matters of faith, to be as good, if not better than the Churches, and to infer from hence, that we make Faith uncertain, is just as if on the contrary one should say, that Protestants make faith certain by exposing matter of faith determined by the Church, to be discussed and reversed by the Judgement and Reason (or rather fancy) of every private man. We have good store of this kind of certainty in England. But as for the use of our Judgement and Reason, as to the matters themselves proposed by the Church, it is the daily business of Divines and Preachers, not only to shew them not to be repugnant to any natural truth, but also to illustrate them with Arguments drawn from reason. But the use, he would have of reason, is, I suppose, to believe nothing, but what his reason can comprehend, and this is not only irrational in its self, but contrary to the Doctrine of S. Paul, where he commands us to captivate our understandings to the Obedience of Faith.

4. He

4. He adds, We expose faith to uncertainty, by making the Church power extend to making new Articles of faith. And this if it were true, were something indeed to his purpose. But the Church never yet owned any such power; in her General Councils, but only to manifest and establish the Doctrine received from her Forefathers; as is to be seen in the proæms of all the Sessions of the Council of Trent, where the Fathers before they declare what is to be believed, ever premise that what they declare, is the same they have received by Tradition from the Apostles. And because it may happen, that some particular Doctrine was not so plainly delivered to each part of the Church, as it happened in S. Cyprianus case, concerning the non-rebaptization of Hereticks, we acknowledge it is in her power, to make that necessary to be believed which was not so before, not by inventing new Articles, but by declaring more explicitly the truths contained in Scripture and Tradition.

Lastly he saith, We expose Faith to great uncertainty, because the Church pretending to infallibility, does not determine Controversies on foot among our selves. As if faith could not be certain, unless all Controversies among particular men be determined, what then becomes of the certainty of Protestants faith, who could yet never find out a sufficient means to determine any one Controversie among them? for if that means be plain Scripture, what one judgeth plain, another judgeth not so, and they acknowledge no Judge between them to decide the Controversie. As for the Catholick Church if any Controversies arise concerning the

the Doctrine delivered ( as in St. Cyprians case ) she determines the Controversie by declaring what is of Faith. And for other Controversies which belong not to faith, she permits, as St. Paul saith, every one to abound in his own sence. And thus much in Answer to his third Argument, by which, and what hath been said to his former Objections, it appears that he hath not at all proved what he asserted in his second Answer to the first Question, viz. That all those who are in the Communion of the Church of Rome do run so great a hazard of their Salvation, that none who have a care of their souls ought to embrace or continue in it. But he hath a third Answer for us, in case the former fail; and it is,

§. 10. That a Protestant leaving the Communion of the Protestant Church doth incur a greater guilt, than one who was bred up in the Church of Rome, and continues therein by invincible ignorance. This is the directest answer he gives to the Question, and what it imports is this, That invincible Ignorance (and he doth not know what allowance God will make for that neither) is the only Anchor which a Catholick hath to save himself by. If by discoursing with Protestants, and reading their Books, he be not sufficiently convinced, whereas he ought in the supposition of the Answerer, to be so; that the Letter of the Scripture as interpretable by every private mans reason is a most certain Rule of Faith and Life, but is still over-ruled by his own Motives ( the same which held St. Austin in the bosom of the Catholick Church, he is guilty of wilful Ignorance and consequently a lost man; there is no



hope of Salvation for him. Much less for a Protestant who shall embrace the Catholick Communion, because he is supposed (doubtless from the same Rule) to have sufficient conviction of the Errors of the Roman Church, or is guilty of wilful Ignorance, If he have it not, which is a damnable sin, and unrepented of destroys salvation. So that now the upshot of the Answer to the Question, Whether a Protestant embracing the Catholick Religion upon the same motives, which one bred and well grounded in it, hath to remain in it, may be equally saved with him, comes to this, that they shall both be damned, though unequally, because the converted Catholick more deeply, than he that was bred so. And now who can but lament the sad condition of that great Doctor and Father of the Church, and hitherto reputed Saint, Austin, who rejecting the Manichees pretended rule of Scripture, upon the aforesaid grounds, left their Communion to embrace the Communion of the Church of Rome? And what is become now of their distinction of points fundamental from not fundamental, which heretofore they thought sufficient to secure both Catholicks and Protestants Salvation, and to charge us with unconscionable uncharitableness in not allowing them to be sharers with us. The absurdities of these consequences may serve for a sufficient conviction of the nullity of his third and last answer to the first Question.

As for what he saith to the second, I agree so far with him, that every Christian is bound to choose the Communion of the purest Church, but

but which that Church is, must be seen by the grounds it brings to prove the Doctrines it teaches, to have been delivered by Christ and his Apostles. That Church is to be judged purest which hath the best grounds: and consequently, it is of necessity to Salvation to embrace the communion of it.

What then you are bound to do in reason and conscience is, to see which Religion of the two, hath the strongest Motives for it, and to embrace that as you will answer the contrary to God and your own soul. To help you to do this, and that the Answerer may have the less exception against them, I will give you a Catalogue of Catholick Motives (though not all neither) in the words of the forecited Dr. Taylor, advertising only for brevity sake: I leave out some mentioned by him, and that in these I set down, you also give allowance for some expressions of his, which he hath mis-represented them: Thus then be, Liberty of Proph. Sect. 20. Speaking of Catholicks. The beauty and Splendour of their Church, their pompous (he should have said) solemn Service; the stateliness and solemnity of the Hierarchy, their name of Catholick, which they suppose (he should have said, their very Adversaries give them) as their own due, and to concern no other Sect of Christians; the Antiquity of many of their Doctrines, (he should have said all) the continual succession of their Bishops, their immediate derivation from the Apostles; their Title to succeed St. Peter, the flattering (he should have said due) expression of Minor Bishops (he means,

acknowledging the Pope head of the Church) which by being old records, have obtained credibility; the multitude and variety of People which are of their perswasion; apparent consent with Antiquity in many Ceremonials, which other Churches have rejected; and a pretended and sometimes (he should have said always) apparent consent with some elder Ages in matters Doctrinal; The great consent of one part with another in that which most of them affirm to be *de fide* (of Faith) The great differences which are commenced among their Adversaries, abusing the liberty of Prophecying into a very great licentiousness; Their happiness of being Instruments in converting divers (he should rather have said of all) Nations. The piety and austerity of their Religious Orders of Men and Women; The single life of their Priests and Bishops, the severity of their Fasts, and their exteriour observances, the great reputation of their first Bishops for faith and sanctity; the known holiness of some of those persons, whose institutes the Religious persons pretend to imitate; the oblique Arts and indirect proceedings of some of those who departed from them, and amongst many other things the names of Heretick and Schismatick which they with infinite pertinacity (he should have said, upon the same grounds the Fathers did) fasten upon all that disagree from them. These things, saith he; and divers others may very easily perswade persons of much reason, and more piety to retain that which they know to have been the Religion of their Fore-fathers, which

which had actually possession and seizure of mens understandings, before the opposite professions ( to wit of Protestant , Presbyterian , Anabaptist, &c. ) had a name.

*Thus Dr. Taylor, an eminent and leading man amongst the Protestants; and if he confess that these Motives were sufficient for a Catholick to retain his Religion, they must be of like force to perswade a dis-interested Protestant to embrace it, unless the Protestants can produce Motives for their Religion of greater, or at least equal force, with these, which so great a man among them confesseth, that Catholicks have for theirs. Here therefore you must call upon the Author of the Paper you sent me to produce a Catalogue of grounds, or at least some one ground for the Protestant Religion of greater or equal force with all these: And as Dr. Taylor saith, divers others which he omitted, viz. The Scripture interpreted by the consent of Fathers, the determination of General Councils, the known Maxim of Catholicks, that nothing is to be believed of Faith, but what was received from their Fore-fathers as handed down from the Apostles. The testimony of the present Church, of no less Authority now, than in St. Austins time, both for the Letter and the sence of the Scripture, &c. Do this, and the Controversie will quickly be at an end. Particular disputes are endless, and above the understanding of such, as are not learned; but in grounds and principles, 'tis not so hard for Reason and common sence to Judge. That you may the better do it in your case, I shall desire you to take these two Cautions along with you:*

First, that the Subject of the present Controversie, are not those Articles in which the Protestants agree with us, and for which they may pretend to produce the same Motives, we do : But in those in which they dissent from us such as are no Transubstantiation, no Purgatory, no honour due to Images, no Invocation to Saints, and the like, in which the very Essence of Protestant, as distinct from Catholick consists. What Motives they can or will produce for these, I do not foresee : The pretence of Scriptures being sufficiently plain hath no place here, because then the foresaid Negatives would be necessary to be believed as divine Truths. And for their own Reason and Learning, it will be found too light when put into the scale against that of the Catholick Church for so many Ages.

The second Caution is, That you be careful to distinguish between Protestants producing grounds for their own Religion, and finding fault with ours. An Atheist can cavil and find fault with the grounds which learned men bring to prove a Deity, such as are the Order of this visible World, the general consent of Nations, &c. In this an Atheist thinks he doth somewhat. But can he produce as good or better grounds for his own opinion ? No, you see then 'tis one thing to produce grounds for what we hold, and another to find fault with those which are produced by the contrary party. The latter hath made Controversie so long, and the former will make it as short ; let the Answerer therefore instead of finding fault with our Motives produce his own for the Articles in Controversie, and I am confident you will quickly discern which carry the most weight, and consequently which are to be preferred.

# A Defence of the foregoing Answer to the Question.

## CHAP. I.

### *Of the Idolatry practised in the Church of Rome, in the Worship of Images.*

The introduction, concerning the occasion of the debate. The Church of Rome makes its members guilty of Hypocrisie or Idolatry: First, Of the Worship of God by Images: Some propositions for clearing the notion of Divine Worship. It is in Gods power to determine the way of his Worship, which being determined, Gods Law, and not our intention, is to be the rule of Worship. The main question is, Whether God hath forbidden the worshipping of himself by an Image, under the notion of Idolatry? Of the meaning of the second Commandment, from the terms therein used; the large sense and importance of them, which cannot be understood only of Heathen Idols. Of the reason of that Law, from Gods infinite and invisible nature: How far that hath been acknowledged by Heathens? The Law against Image Worship no ceremonial



*Law, respecting meerly the Jews; the reason against it made more clear by the Gospel: The wiser Heathen did not worship their Images as Gods, yet their worship condemned as Idolatry. The Christian Church believed the reason of this Law to be immutable; Of the Doctrine of the second Council of Nice; the opposition to it in Greece, Germany, France and England. Of the Scripture Instances of Idolatry contrary to the second Commandment, in the Golden Calf, and the Calves of Dan and Bethel. Of the distinction used to excuse image worship from being Idolatry: The vanity and folly of them. The instances supposed to be parallel answered.*

The Intro-  
duction.

*Madam,*

§. I. **T**Hat increase of Controversies in my answer, which the Proposer of the Questions, calls a *superfétation*, was but the natural issue of his own Questions. To which, I could not give a just answer, without mentioning the hazards a person runs of his salvation in the communion of the *Roman Church*: and if he thinks these too many (as in truth they are) he ought to condemn that *Church* for it, which hath been the cause of them. And, I know no other end I had herein, but to let you see, there can be no reason to forsake the communion of our *Church*, wherein the way of salvation is the same with that of the *Apostolical* and *Primitive Church*, for another, which hath degenerated so much from it; as I hope will appear in the following Discourse.

To

To wave therefore any farther debate, concerning the terms or sense of the Questions: As to the occasion of them, I could not but suppose it to relate to your own condition; and I dare appeal to himself, Whether the Question of the possibility of the salvation of a *Protestant* turn'd to the *Church of Rome* were moved for any other end, than thereby the easier to draw persons of our *Church* into their communion; which being so common, and yet so weak an Artifice, I had reason to premise an answer to that purpose: and I do still affirm, that such a possibility being granted, it is no sufficient Motive to any one to leave the communion of one *Church* for another. And whether this be to his Question or no, I am sure it is very much to the purpose, for which this Controversie was first started. I beseech you therefore, *Madam*, do not so much disparage your own Judgment, and the *Church* you have been bred up in, as to forsake it, till some better reason be offered, than the Proposer pretends that his Questions imply: Which, if not for your own sake, yet for mine I desire you to insist upon, that I may know one reason at least, from them, (which I cannot yet procure, although I have often requested it) why the believing all the ancient *Creeeds* and leading a good life, may not be sufficient to salvation, unless one be of the communion of the *Church of Rome*? But lest I should be thought to digress, I return to his Papers, and am willing to pass over his unhandy reflection on our *Church* as in a sinking condition, which God hath hitherto preserved, and I hope

hope will do, to the confusion of its enemies. But why he should call my comparison a supposition, and his own a truth, before he proved their *Church* to be the *Catholick Church*, I am yet to seek. And so I come to the main business.

§. 2. My second answer was, *That all those who are in the communion of the Church of Rome, do run so great a hazard of their salvation, that none who have a care of their souls, ought to embrace it, or continue in it; which I am amazed he should say, was not pertinent to the Question, if the Question were propounded for any ones satisfaction, that doubted which Churches communion it were best to embrace? This I proved,*

Of the  
Idolatry  
of the  
Roman  
Church.

1. Because *They must by the terms of that communion, be guilty either of Hypocrisie or Idolatry; either of which, are sins inconsistent with salvation. Here he charges me with a contradiction; because I over-prove what I intended; but he may easily excuse me from it, if he will allow the possibility of salvation to any one who commits any wilful sins; for in the case of any such sins, it is true, that they are inconsistent with salvation, and yet he that doth commit them, doth but run the hazard of salvation, because he may repent of them. But if it be a contradiction to say, that some sins are inconsistent with salvation, yet those who commit them, may be saved, though hardly; he must make all who commit any wilful sin to be unavoidably damned; and then it is to no purpose, what Church we are of.*

The

The meaning therefore was this, That Hypocrisie and Idolatry, are sins inconsistent with a state of salvation; and there is no way to escape being damned, but by the repentance of those who are guilty of them. ( But of this more at large in the vindication of my third Answer) And those who are in the communion of the Church of Rome, must be guilty either of the one or the other of these, I proved by this Argument, That Church which requires giving to the creature the Worship due only to the Creator, makes the members of it guilty of Hypocrisie or Idolatry; but the Church of Rome in the Worship of God by Images, the adoration of Bread in the Eucharist, and the formal invocation of Saints, doth require giving to the creature the worship due only to the Creator, therefore it makes the members of it guilty of Hypocrisie or Idolatry. Which I did prove by parts.

1. §. 3. Concerning the *Worship of God by Images*, I proved that it could not be terminated on God, because in the second Commandment he not only denies to receive it, but threatens to punish those who give it. To this he answers, 1. That it is a contradiction to say, that it is the worship of God by an Image, and yet be terminated wholly on the Creature. 2. That this is built, on a mistake of the nature of humane acts, which though they ought to be governed by the Law of God, yet when they swerve from it, cease not to tend to their own proper objects: and that Gods prohibition of such or such a kind of Worship, may make it to be unlawful, but hinders not the act from tending, whither it is

Of the  
Worship  
of Images.

is intended; which he proves by the prayers of Thieves and Murderers, to God for good success; the Jews offering to God in Sacrifice the blind and the lame, which he hath forbidden; Cains offering a Sacrifice to God, which he refused to accept of; from whence he concludes, That though God should have forbidden men to worship him by Images; yet it doth not follow, but the worship so given, would be terminated on him. 3. That the second Commandment only forbids the worship of Idols, or the giving the Sovereign honour due to God to an Idol; but this doth not forbid the worship of Images, because they give to them only an inferiour and relative honour, and not, that worship which is due to God. This is the substance of his answer: but to let you see the insufficiency of it, I shall prove these two things: 1. That where God hath prohibited any particular way or means of giving worship to himself, that worship so given, cannot be said to be terminated on him. 2. That God in the second Commandment hath expressly prohibited the giving any worship to himself by an Image; and not barely the worship of Idols.

1. That where God hath prohibited any particular way or means of giving worship to himself, that worship so given, cannot be said to be terminated on him: And however new this way of proposing this Argument seems to him, I do not question to make it good, notwithstanding his so peremptory denying it, as absolutely false. But in order to the clearing of it, I shall lay down these Propositions.

I. That

1. That worship is nothing else but an external signification of honour and respect. For we do not here speak concerning the bare internal acts of the mind; but of the way whereby the esteem we have in our minds, is expressed in such a manner as to give honour to that which we so esteem.

2. That the signification of honour, which is due to God is not to be measured by the intentions of men, against the declared will of God. For, it being in his power to determine in what way we will be worshipped, we are not to enquire, whether men do intend any act of theirs for his honour; but whether God doth allow it or no? And herein lyes his great mistake in thinking, *That mens intentions are to be the rule of Divine Worship*: so that what they design for the honour of God, must needs end in it, Whereas, if God hath the power of making a rule for his own worship, he cannot be honoured by mens doing any thing against his declared Will, whatever their intention be. For, then God might be honoured by the most palpable acts of disobedience; which is a plain contradiction; for what can be greater dishonour to God, than to break his Laws for his Honour.

3. The Divine Law being the rule of Worship, all prohibited ways of worship must receive that *denomination* which God himself gives them. As if a Prince should declare it by his Laws, to be *Treason* for any man to bow down to a Sign-Post with his head upon it, under pretence of giving the greater honour to his Prince; I desire to know, whether a mans intentions



ons of honouring his Prince thereby, excuse him from Treason or no? So it is in our case, if God absolutely prohibits the worship of himself by an Image ( whatever the intention of the person be ) and calls this by the name of *Idolatry*, no mans directing the intention of his mind beyond the Image, can excuse him from it. For whither soever this worship may finally be directed by the intention of the worshipper, it is plain that God ( who certainly is the best Judge in this case ) does interpret it to be terminated on the Image: And therefore the

Act. 7. 41. *Scripture* says, that the *Israelites* when they  
 42. worshipped the *Calf*, offered *Sacrifice* to an *Idol*,  
 Psal. 106. and that *they worshipped the molten Image*, not  
 119. God by it, though they so intended. From whence it necessarily follows, that the worship of God by an Image, when himself hath prohibited it, and declared it *Idolatry*, ( as I shall prove he hath done in the second Commandment ) ought not to be said to be terminated on *God*, but only on the Image; for no man will be so absurd, as to say, that an act of *Idolatry* is terminated upon *God*. By which we see, how far it is from the appearance of a contradiction, to say that the worship of *God* by an Image being declared to be *Idolatry* by himself, should be terminated wholly on the Creature, ( which are but other words explaining the nature of *Idolatry* ) and what an easie answer will take off all his other Instances. For those do not suppose, any prohibited object or means of worship, which is the only thing we speak of; but either praying to the true God for bad ends,

ends, as in the case of *Thieves and Murderers* praying for good success; or bringing something in Sacrifice to him which he had forbidden, as the *Jews* offering the blind and the lame: or some milcarriage in the minds of them that sacrifice or pray to him, as in *Cains oblation*, and *wicked mens prayers*; but all these are very remote from the present debate, concerning an *object* or *means of worship* prohibited by God himself under the notion of *Idolatry*. This being cleared, I come to prove the second, in which (as he truly observes) the main force of this argument consists.

§. 4. 2. That God in the second Commandment hath expressly prohibited the giving any worship to himself by an Image: and not merely giving the worship of God to Idols, as he asserts. Our Controversie now being about the sense of a Law, the best ways we have to find out the meaning of it, are either, from the terms wherein it is expressed, or from the reason annexed to it, or from the judgment of those, whom we believe best able to understand, and interpret it. I shall therefore prove that to be the meaning of this Law of God which I have set down, from every one of these ways.

1. From the terms wherein the Law is expressed: this I the rather insist upon; because it is the way himself hath chosen: for he saith, *The Hebrew word Pesel, in Latin Sculptile is used in Scripture to signifie an Idol, and so the LXX. translate it in this place by εἰδωλον*; and therefore saith, it was an artifice of the Protestants to transmute it Image instead of Idol, and not any certain

Of the meaning of the second Commandment.

certain kind of Image neither, but any whatsoever; Thou shalt not make to thy self any graven Image, instead of, Thou shalt not make to thy self an Idol. By his own acknowledgment then, we are to judge the sense of the Law, by the importance of the words therein used; but I shall prove, First, That supposing *Pesel* did signifie only an Idol, yet that were not enough. Secondly, That *Pesel* is very properly rendred by the Protestants, and that it doth not signifie barely an Idol.

1. Supposing that were the signification of *Pesel* which he contends for, that were not enough, unless there had been no other word but that used in the Law: but another word is added, to prevent a mistake of that nature, of as large a signification as may be to this purpose: which is, *Tbemuna*, which they render *similitude* as well as we; and is never used, in the whole Scripture, to signifie such an Idol as he supposes this Law intends. To what purpose then are words of the largest signification put into a Law; if the sense be limited according to the most narrow acceptation of one word mentioned therein? For there is no kind of Image, whether graven, or painted, whether of a real or imaginary being, but is comprehended under the signification of the words set down in the Law: for not only the making a *similitude* in general, is forbidden, but any kind of *similitude* whether of things in Heaven, or Earth, or under the Earth, to bow down to them, or worship them. I confess it cannot enter into my mind, how God should have forbidden the worship

worship of Images by more exprefs and emphatical words than he hath done; and if he had used any other words, their sense might as well have been perverted as these are. If a Prince should under a very severe penalty forbid all his subjects making any *Image* or *resemblance*, with an intent to give honor to him by kneeling before it; would not that man be thought very ridiculous, who should go about to interpret the *Law* thus, that the Prince did not forbid them to make any *picture* of *Himself* or his *Son*, or any of his *Favourites* (for the worship of these could not but redound to his own *Honour*) but only forbid them to make the Image of an *Ape*, or an *Ass*, or a *Tyger*, thinking to honour their Prince thereby? Much such an Exposition is that, here given of the *Law*; *God* forbids any Image or similitude to be made with respect to his worship (for it is ridiculous to imagine the *Law* means any thing else) but, he saith, *This Law must not be understood to exclude a Crucifix*, nor I suppose any Image of *God* himself: (at least as he appeared of old;) nor of his *Saints* or *Angels*, with an intention to worship *God* by them; but only they should not worship *Apis* or *Dagon*, an *Ichneumon* or a *Crocodile*, or any of the most ridiculous follies of the Heathen. If this had been the meaning of the *Law*, why was it not more plainly exprest? Why were none of the words elsewhere used, by way of contempt of the *Heathen Idols* here mentioned, as being less liable to ambiguity? why in so short a comprehension of *Laws*, is this *Law* so much enlarged above

what it might have been, if nothing but what he saith, were only meant by it? For then the meaning of the two first Precepts might have been summed up in very few words: *You shall have no other Gods but me; and you shall worship the Images of no other Gods but me.* This is his meaning, but far enough from being that of the *second Commandment*.

2. The only word he insists upon, which is *Pesel*, is very properly rendred an *Image*, and it doth not signifie barely an *Idol*: the word properly signifies any thing that is *carved*, or *cut out of wood or stone*: and it is no less than forty several times rendred by the *LXX.* by γλυψίδον, *sculpiile*, and but thrice by ἰδωλον, and which is very observable, although *Exod.* 20. 4. they render it by ἰδωλον, yet in the repetition of the *Law*, *Deut.* 5. 8. the *Alexandrian MS.* hath it γλυψίδον, and *Deut.* 4. 16. in other Copies of the *LXX.* the same word is translated γλυψίδον, from whence it is plain, that when they translate it by an *Idol*, they mean no more thereby than a *graven image*; and *Isa.* 40. 18. they translate it, by ἰκων, which is properly an *Image*; so that no assistance can be given him by that *Translation*; and the *Vulgar Latin* it self useth *Idolum*, *Sculpiile* and *Imago*, all to expresse the same thing. By which it appears, that any Image being made so far the object of Divine Worship, that men do bow down before it; doth thereby become an *Idol*, and on that account is forbidden in this *Commandment*.

*Isa.* 44. 9,  
10, 13.

§. 5. 3. We consider the *reason* given of this Law, which will more fully explain the meaning of it; which the *Scripture* tells us, was derived from *Gods* infinite and incomprehensible nature, which could not be represented to men, but in a way that must be an infinite disparagement to it. *To whom will ye liken God? or what likeness will ye compare unto him? The workman melteth a graven Image, and the Goldsmith spreadeth it over with gold, &c. Have ye not known? Have ye not heard? Hath it not been told you from the beginning? Have ye not understood from the foundation of the earth? It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, &c. I desire to know whether this reason be given against Heathen Idols, or those Images which were worshipped for Gods or no? or whether, by this reason God doth not declare, that all worship given to him by any visible representation of him, is extremely dishonourable to him? And to this purpose, when this Precept is enforced on the people of *Israel* by a very particular caution, Take ye therefore good heed to your selves, lest ye corrupt your selves, and make you a graven Image, the similitude of any figure, &c. The ground of that caution, is expressed in these words; For ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you. If the whole intention of the Law, were only to keep them from worshipping the Heathen Idols, or Images for Gods, to what purpose is it here mentioned that they saw no similitude of God when he spake to them? For although God appeared with a similitude then, yet*

Of the reason of the second Commandment.

Isa. 40.19.

20.

21.

22.

Deu. 4.15, 16, &c.



there might have been great reason against worshipping the *Heathen Idols*, or fixing the intention of their Worship upon the *bare Image*. But this was a very great reason, why they ought not to think of honouring *God* by an Image; for if he had judged that, a suitable way of Worship to his Nature and Excellency; he would not have left the choice of the *Similitude* to themselves, but would have appeared himself in such a *Similitude* as had best pleased him.

Of the  
wiser Hea-  
thens No-  
tion of  
Images.  
*Theodoret.*  
*c. Græc.*  
*Serm. 3. p.*  
*519.*

§. 6. From hence the wiser persons of the *Heathens* themselves condemned the Worship of *God* by Images, as incongruous to a Divine Nature, and a disparagement to the *Deity*. So *Theodoret* tells us, that *Zeno* in his Books of Government, did absolutely forbid the making any Images for Worship, because they were not things worthy of *God*: And that *Xenophanes Colophonius* derided the folly of those who made their Images which they Worshipped, to be like themselves, and by the same reason, saith he, if Horses and Elephants could paint as men can, no doubt the Gods would be made in their shape; as the *Ethiopians*, and *Thracians*, and others, made their Gods in their own colour and fashion: But he adds, That the true God ought not to be represented by the resemblance of men to whom he was unlike in body and mind. And that the reason which hindred *Plato* from prohibiting all manner of Images, was only the fear of *Socrates* his Fate: for, saith he, he did forbid all private Images, all Images of Gold

*Clem. Alex.*  
*and. Strom.*  
*5. p. 584.*

Gold and Silver, of Ivory, of Iron and Brass, and left only Wood and Stone, which being so contemptible matter, might more easily keep the people from Worshipping Images made of them: As God himself, saith he, derideth the Idolatry in the Prophet, he burneth part therefore in the fire, and the residue thereof maketh he a God, even his graven Image. Antisthenes in Clements Alexandrinus condemns the use of Images for Instruction, because there is so great a dissimilitude between God and any visible representation of him, that no man can learn any thing of God, from an Image: and Xenophon to the same purpose, that God is great and powerful, but we know not how to represent him. And Clemens gives that reason why Numa prohibited among the Romans all Images to represent the Deity, because we could not attain to any due conception of the Deity, but only by our minds; which is the same reason that Plutarch gives. And therefore Varro in the known Testimony to this purpose, speaking of the old Romans who had no Images for 170. years in their Divine Worship, saith, that if the same Custom had continued, their Worship would have been more pure and chaste, & that those who first placed Images in places of Divine Worship, increased their Error, and took away their Reverence; Wisely judging, saith S. Augustine, that the folly of Images would easily bring the Deity into contempt. And Augustus, as Agrippa in Philo reports, after he understood, that the Jews in their Temple had no Images or visible representations of the Deity, expressed his wonder with great Reverence, having no

Isa. 44. 16,

17.

Clem. Alex-  
and. Pro-  
trept. p. 46.

Strom. 1. p.

304.

Plutarch lib.  
Numa.

Varro apud  
Augustin. de  
Civit. Dei,  
l. 4. c. 31.

Philo de  
legat. ad.  
Caium p.  
1035.

*Eusebius de  
prepar.*

*Evang. l. 6.*

*c. 10.*

*Herod. t. 2.*

*Strabo l. 15.*

*Dior. Laert.*

*proem.*

*Tacit. de*

*morib. Ger-*

*man. c. 9.*

*Lucian. de*

*Dea Syria.*

*in.*

mean skill in *Philosophy*. So that we see the wisest persons, who had no such *Law* from *God* to direct them, yet by the bare use of reason did agree in the thing it self, that it was unsuitable to the Divine Nature to Worship *God* by any Images or visible representations of him. From hence we have reason to suppose, among the more ancient Nations who kept nearer to the dictates of Natural Reason, the Worship of *Images* was almost generally rejected. So *Bardefanes* in *Eusebius* saith of the most Eastern Countries then known: of the *Seres* and the *Brachmanus*; So *Herodotus*, *Strabo*, *Diogenes Laertius* say of the *Persians*: So *Tacitus* of the *Germans*, that they rejected Images, because they thought them unsuitable to the greatness of their Deities. So *Lucian* likewise saith of the most ancient *Egyptians*; and *Historians* agree of the *Romans*, as we have already seen. If all this had been a meer positive *Law* intended only for the *Jews*, because of their dulness and stupidity, as some imagine, whence comes it to pass that those who never heard of this *Law* yet judged such a way of Worship to be wholly unbecoming a Divine Nature? It was not merely the fear lest they should worship the Images themselves for *Gods*, which was the reason of the Commandment, but the incongruity of such a way of Worship to a Being supposed to be of an infinite and spiritual nature.

The reason  
of this  
Law more  
clear by  
the Gospel.

§. 7. And it seems of all things the most strange to me, that any person should think this Precept only respected the *Jewish Oeconomy*, & that

that now under the *Gospel* where we have clearer discoveries of *Gods* spiritual nature and worship, that we should be left at liberty to do that, which was before, unlawful to be done. Was it inconsistent with *Gods* nature then, and is it less so now, when we understand his nature much better? and that is given as a particular reason why we ought to Worship him after a *spiritual manner*; and not by any corporeal representation, as the *Jews* say the *Samaritans* Worshipped *God* in the form of a *Dove* in their Temple on Mount *Garizim*: in which, notwithstanding what *Morinus* saith, there seems to be no improbability, not only from our *Saviours* words and the occasion of speaking them to a *Samaritan* woman (which we do not find he insisted on so much to the *Jews* as being then free from this kind of *Idolatry*) and the constant tradition of the *Jews*; but from the nature of the *Samaritan* Religion which they received from the ten Tribes, which Worshipped *God* under *Images* (as will appear afterwards) and the agreeableness of the Symbol of a *Dove* to the name of *Semiramis* and their *Assyrian* off-spring among whom the *Dove* was accounted Sacred. But however this be, since the reason of this command, drawn from the invisible and spiritual nature of *God*, is now enforced upon us by the *Gospel*, as the ground of giving *Spiritual Worship* to *God*; how can any men in their senses imagine that Worship to be lawful among *Christians* which was unlawful to the *Jews*? Is it, that there is now no danger of falling into *Heathen Idolatry*,

John 4.  
23, 24.

*Morinus* in  
*Pentateuch.*  
*Samarit.*  
*Exerc. 1.*  
*S. 9. c. 5.*

as there was among the *Jews*, on which account *God* tied them up so strictly in this point of *Images*? But this is to beg the Question, and to take it for granted, that there was no other reason of this Command; whereas *God* himself hath told us another, and that is, the incongruity of it to his infinite nature; which the very *Heathens* themselves apprehended in this case. I grant *God* might by this means design to keep them at the greatest distance from the *Heathen Idolatry*; but that doth not hinder, but there was an evil in the thing it self, as it doth imply so great a disparagement of the Divine Nature to be worshipped by a corporeal representation. As we may say that the prohibition of common *Swearing* was intended by *God* to keep men from *perjury*; but besides that, it implies so great an irreverence of *God*, that it is evil without that further respect. And can any one imagine, there should be greater irreverence of *God* shewn in calling him to witness upon ever slight occasion, than there is in bowing down before a block or a hewen stone representing *God* to my mind by it? What can such an Image do to the heightning of devotion, or raising affections? if it be by calling to my mind that *Being* I am to worship, then there must be supposed some *likeness*, or *Analogy*, or *Union* between the object represented and the Image, every one of which tends highly to the dishonour of the *Deity*, and suggests mean thoughts to us of the *God* we are to worship. And is there no danger among Christians, that they should entertain too

low and unworthy thoughts of God? and can any thing tend to it more effectually, than the bringing down the representations of him to the figure and lineaments of a man, drawn upon a Table, or carved in an *Image*? On which account, it seems much more reasonable for me to worship *God* by prostrating my self to the Sun, or any of the Heavenly bodies; nay to an Ant or a Fly, than to a picture or an *Image*: For in the other I see great evidences of the power, and wisdom and goodness of God, which may suggest venerable apprehensions of *God* to my mind; whereas these can have nothing worthy admiration, unless it be the skill of the Painter or Artificer? And I cannot for my heart, understand; why I may not as well, nay better, burn Incense and say my Prayers to the Sun, having an intention only to honour the true *God* by it, as to do both those to an *Image*: I am sure the *Sun* hath far more advantages, than any artificial *Image* can have; the beauty and influence of it may inflame & warm ones devotions much more. If the danger be, that I am more like to take the *Sun* for *God* than an *Image*; on that account, that which deserves most honour should have least given it, and that which deserves least should have most. For the danger is there still greater, where the excellency is greater, and by that means we ought rather to worship a beast than a *Saint*, for there is less danger of believing one to be *God* than the other, and so the *Ægyptians* were more excusable than the *Papists*. I must ingenuously confess, if I had been an *Heathen* Idolater,



*Idolatry*, only upon such principles as these that there is one supreme infinite *Being*, who makes use of some more illustrious beings of the world, to communicate benefits to the rest, on which account, I thought my self bound to testify the honour I owe to the supreme *Deity*, by paying my devotions in subordination to him, to those subservient and ministerial *Gods*; I should not have been afraid, of what any *Papists* in the World could have said for my Confutation. Nay, I should have been tempted to have laughed at their folly and despised their weakness, who should plead for the worship of *God* in or by a dull and rude image, and condemn me for honouring *God* in the most noble parts of the Creation? If they had told me, *that the supreme God, must have a worship proper to himself*; Yes, I should answer them in their own terms, I by no means question it, and that is it, which is called *λατρεία*, which is reserved to the supreme *Deity*, all that I give to inferiour *Deities*, is but *δουλεία*, only the *Sun* deserved an *εὐδελία*, because of his eminent usefulness. If they had said, *I made them Gods, by giving them religious Worship*: no more, than they do Images. If yet they had urged, *that God had forbidden Worshipping the Host of Heaven*; Yes, that is, giving the Worship to the Supreme *God* to them, but not a subordinate relative, inferiour Worship, which was all I intended; and I hope they are not so ignorant of the nature of humane actions, as not to know that they go whither they are intended; and my intent was only to honour the true *God* by it: or else, that the

Wor-

Worshipping the Host of Heaven was forbidden to the dull and stupid *Jews*, who had no kind of *Philosophy* in them, and did not see these admirable Images of the Divine perfections in them. which I did; but for men of Philosophical and contemplative minds, what injury to *God* could there be, as long as the more I saw cause to honour these, far greater I still saw to honour him who produced all these things? or lastly, I would appeal to themselves whether the precept against *Worshipping the host of Heaven*, or *Images* were more plain in the *Scripture*? the second commandment is not in words against the Worship of the *things* but the *Images* of them, and the first against *Worshipping* them as the *Supreme God*; I did neither; but they could not possibly excuse themselves who did the same things to an Image, which they do to *God* himself. Thus we see the reason of the commandment is by no means appropriated to the *Jews*, but doth extend as far as the knowledge of it doth: and the same arguments which notwithstanding that command would justify the Worship of Images, will likewise justify the most early, the most general, the most lasting *Idolatry* of the World, which is the Worship of the Sun, Moon, and Stars. And a mighty Argument that the reason of this command, drawn from the unsuitableness of the Worship of Images to the nature of *God* is of an unalterable and universal nature, is, that the same reason is urged under the New Testament against the *Idolatry* of the *Heathens*. So *St. Paul* dealt with the *Athenians* proving

Act. 17.  
24, 25.

proving the unreasonableness of their Worship-  
 ping God by Images, because *he was the God that  
 made the World and is Lord of Heaven and  
 Earth, and that we are his off-spring, therefore we  
 ought not to think that the God-head is like unto*  
 29. *Gold or Silver, or Stone graven by art or mans de-  
 vice*: he doth not not speak meerly against their  
 other objects of Worship besides the true God,  
 nor their supposing their Gods to be present in  
 their Images, nor taking their images for Gods,  
 but against their supposition that there was any  
 resemblance between God and their Images, or  
 that he was capable of receiving any honour by  
 them. The same Argument he useth to the

Rom. 1. 19

21. *Romans, speaking of those, in whom that which  
 may be known of God is manifest, even his eter-  
 nal power and God-head, yet these persons who  
 knew God, did not glorifie him as God, but chang-  
 ed the glory of the incorruptible God into an*  
 23. *Image made like to corruptible man, &c. where  
 changing his glory into Images, is immediat-  
 ly opposed to the glorifying him as God, in re-  
 spect of his eternal power and God-head; so  
 that those two are inconsistent with each other,  
 to glorifie God by an Image and to glorifie him  
 as God. For here the Apostle doth not dis-  
 course against the most gross and sottish Ido-  
 lators of the Heathens, but as St. Chrysostom  
 well observes against the Philosophers and the  
 wisest among them: Who, though they differ-  
 ed in their opinions of Religion extremely from  
 the Vulgar, yet they concurred with them in all  
 the external practices of their Idolatry. And  
 therefore the Apostle doth not charge them  
 with*

with false notions of a Deity, for he saith, *they held the truth in unrighteousness; that they knew God, but they shewed their vanity and folly in thinking they had found out subtiler ways of defending the common Idolatries among them, instead of opposing them, made use of their wits, to excuse them. And the most intelligent Heathens did never look on their Images as any other, than symbols or representations of that Being to which they give divine Worship. No one but a Fool thinks otherwise of them, saith Celsus; They are only Books for the ignorant saith Porphyrie, and the Heathens in Athanasius. They deny, in Arnobius, that they ever thought their Images to be gods, or to have any Divinity in them, but what only comes from their Consecration, to such an Use; and in St. Augustin, that they worshipped the Images themselves, but through them they worshipped the Deity; Maximus Tyrius discourses largely on this Subject, and shews, that Images were but the signs of divine honour, and helps to remembrance. They are but Symbols of the presence of the Gods, saith Julian; We do not think them Gods, saith he, but that through them we may Worship the Deity; for we being in the body, ought to perform our Service in a way agreeable to it. And Eusebius testifies in general of the Heathens, that they did not look on their Images as Gods; however some among them had an opinion of the Gods being incorporated in them. I desire to know whether these men who worshipped Images upon those grounds did amiss or no in it? I do not ask, whether they*

*Celsus and*  
*Origen. l. 7.*  
*p. 373.*  
*Euseb. de*  
*preparat.*  
*Evangel. l. 3.*  
*c. 7.*  
*Athanas. c.*  
*Gent. p.*  
*24-31.*  
*Arnob. c.*  
*Gent. l. 6.*  
*p. 103.*  
*August.*  
*Ton. 8. in*  
*Psal. 113.*  
*Maxim.*  
*Tyrius dis-*  
*sert. 38.*  
*Julian or.*  
*frag. ep. ad.*  
*Peccat.*  
*p. 537.*  
*Euseb. p. e-*  
*pa. Evangel.*  
*l. 4. c. 1.*

*Trigant. de  
Christianis.  
Exposit.  
apud Sinas,  
l. 5. c. 16.  
p. 588.*

they were mistaken as to the *objects* of their Worship; but on supposition they were not, whether they were to blame in the manner of serving God by Images, in such a way as they describe? If not, wherefore doth St. Paul pitch upon that, to condemn them for, which they were not at all to blame in? He ought to have done as the *Jesuits* in *China* did, who never condemned the people for worshipping Images, but for worshipping false Gods by them; and perswaded them not to lay them aside, but to convert them to the honour of the true God; and so melted down their former Images, and made new ones of them. Can we imagine St. Paul meant the same thing, when he blames men not for believing them to be Gods, but that God could be worshipped by the work of mens hands; and for changing thereby the glory due to God in regard of his infinite and incorruptible being, into mean and unworthy Images thinking thereby to give honour to him.

The Christian Church believed this Law immutable  
*Clem. Alex. Strom. 5. p. 559.*  
*Origen. c. col. l. 7. p. 375.*

*L. 6. p. 284.*

§. 8. And upon these grounds the Primitive Fathers disputed against the Heathen Idolatry; for, the making use of corporeal representations makes the Deity contemptible, saith Clemens of Alexandria. Origen saith, That Christians have nothing to do with Images, because of the second Commandment; and on that account will rather dye, than defile themselves with them: and that it is impossible any one that knows God, should pray to them. That it is no sufficient excuse to say, they do not take them for Gods, but only for symbols or representations of them, for they must be

be ignorant, mean, and unlearned persons, who can imagine the work of an Artificer can be any representation of a Deity. It would be too tedious at this time to transcribe all the invectives in the Writings of the Fathers upon this subject: where they dispute against the Heathens from this argument, and do still suppose the force of the reason of this Law, to oblige Christians as much as ever it did the Jews; but I purposely forbear, only taking notice that after the worship of Images came in, with the decay of the Primitive Piety and Learning in the Eastern Churches, yet the great defenders of them still declared their abhorrence of any representation of the Divine Nature. So Germanus Patriarch of Constantinople in his Epistles, yet extant in the actions of that wise Synod at Nice; We make, saith he, no kind of Image, or similitude, or figure, or representation of the invisible Deity; and that the meaning of the Commandment of the Law against Images was, that the Divine Nature was invisible and incomprehensible, and like to nothing we see, and that we ought not to entertain any corporeal conceptions of God. And Damascen saith expressly, That it is the highest madness and impiety to go about to make an Image of God: i. e. saith Clichtovæus, so as to think any Image to be like unto God, or able perfectly to represent him to us, which is likewise Bellarmins answer: as though ever any men were such fools to believe an Image could perfectly represent an infinite Being; or that God need to make a Law to forbid that, which is utterly impossible in the very nature of the thing;

Synod. Nic.  
2. Act. 4.  
Ep. ad  
Johan.  
Synod.  
Ad Thom.  
Claudiop.  
Ep. ibid.  
Damascen.  
Orthod. fid.  
l. 4. c. 17.



*Bellarmin. de  
Imag. l. 2.  
cap. 8.*

thing; he might more reasonably forbid men to paint a sound, to grasp all the Air in the hollow of their hands, to drink up the Ocean, to wear the *Sun* for a *Pendant* at their ears, or to make new worlds, than to command them not to make any Image which should perfectly represent his Nature: And yet of this kind of Image alone of the true *God*, *Bellarmino* understands the prohibition of the *Law*, and the sayings before mentioned; but *all other*, he saith, were allowed by both, whether by way of History or analogical resemblance, or the fashion of a man wherein he hath appeared: i. e. all possible representations of *God* are allowed, and only that which is impossible forbidden. But this answer is not more weak and trifling, than contrary to the meaning of *Germanus*, *Ibasius*, or the rest of the *Nicene Fathers*, who do acknowledge, there was no ground to make any Images with respect to the *Divine Nature*, till the incarnation of *Christ*; but since *God* appeared in humane nature, there is no incongruity in representing that by an Image, and by that to give honour to the invisible *Godhead*, as long as they preterve the true belief concerning the Deity; and consequently may honour *God*, by giving worship to the Images of those *Saints*, whom they believe to be in Heaven with *God*.

Of the  
Doctrine of  
the second  
Council of  
*Nice*.

§. 9. This is the substance of the Doctrine of the second Council of *Nice*; which they justify by fabulous stories, and impertinent citations, and insufficient answers. For, when the *Fathers* of the Synod at *Constantinople* had

had said, " that *Christ* came to deliver us from *Synod. Nic.*  
 " all *Idolatry*, and to teach the worship of God *Gen. 2.*  
 " in Spirit and in Truth ; they bravely answer, *Act. 6.*  
*That then it is impossible for Christians to fall*  
*into Idolatry, because Christs Kingdom was al-*  
*ways to continue, and the gifts and graces of*  
*God are without repentance. Which would as*  
*well hold against the prevalency of the Turk,*  
*as Idolatry among them. Those Fathers urge,*  
*"That the Devil now, not being able to re-*  
*"duce the world to the former Idolatry, en-*  
*"deavours under-hand to introduce it, under a*  
*"pretence of Christianity, bringing them again*  
*"to the worship of the creature, and making a*  
*"God of a thing that is made, when they have*  
*"called it by the name of Christ. These an-*  
*swer, That it is true, the Fathers used that*  
*Argument against the Arrians, who supposed Christ*  
*to be a Creature, and they grant that they were*  
*guilty of Idolatry in giving Divine worship to*  
*Christ, when they believed him to be a creature ;*  
*but the difference lies herein, that the Arrians*  
*trusted in Christ, and gave properly divine honour*  
*to him, which they say, they did not to the Images,*  
*but only worshipped them for the sake of the ob-*  
*ject represented by them. But Aquinas and his*  
 followers have at large proved, that where any  
 thing is worshipped, meerly for the sake of  
 another, it must have the same kind of wor-  
 ship given it, which they give to the thing  
 represented by it: for as *Aquinas* observes,  
 the motion of the soul towards an Image is  
 twofold: either as it is a thing, or as it is an  
 Image: the first, he saith is distinct from that

*Aquinas*  
*Summ. p. 3.*  
*q. 25. art. 3.*

motion which respects the object; but the second is the same; so that to the Image of *Christ*, as made of *Wood* or *Stone*, no worship at all is given: and therefore it being given meerly on the account of its being an Image, it necessarily follows, that the same worship must be given to the Image, which is given to *Christ* himself. And so they are in the same case with the *Arians*, whom they acknowledge to be *Idolaters*, notwithstanding their *Christianity*, or that the gifts and graces of *God* are without repentance. Besides the *Constantinopolitan Fathers* urge "The great absurdity of making an Image of "*Christ*, for worship, because *Christ* is *God* and "*Man*; therefore the Image must be of *God* "*and Man*, which cannot be, unless the Deity "*be circumscribed within the created flesh*, "*or there be a confusion of both natures after* "*their union, both which are blasphemies* "*condemned by the Church.* The *Nicene Fathers* in answer to this yield, *That the Name* "*Christ* is significative of both natures, and that "*Image* can only represent the visible humane "*nature, and that it agrees only in name, and not in* "*substance with the thing represented: and after* "*many reviling expressions against their adversaries, (no argument of the goodness of their* "*cause) they say, that if the Divine nature were* "*circumscribed within the humane nature in the* "*Cradle, and on the Cross, then it is in an Image* "*if not in one, neither is it in the other.* But "*what doth this answer signifie, unless there* "*be an equal presence and union of the Divine* "*nature of *Christ* with the Image, as then*

was with the humane nature? Which union, was the reason of the adoration given to the person of *Christ*; and what ground can there be then of giving divine worship to the Image of *Christ*, unless the same union be supposed? If the humane nature without the union of the divine, could yield us no sufficient reason of divine worship being given to it, how much less can an Image deserve it, which can only at the best represent but the external lineaments of that humane nature? And if the divine nature be supposed united with the Image, then the same divine honor is due to the Image of *Christ*, which is to God himself, which yet these *Nicene Fathers* deny: and the Image then joyned with the divine nature, is as proper an object of divine worship without respect to any Prototype, as the person of *Christ* is consisting of the divine and humane nature. Again, they urge, "If the humane nature of *Christ* be represented in the Image of *Christ* to be worshipped, as separate from the divine, this would be plain *Nestorianism*. To this the good *Nicene Fathers*, not knowing what to answer, plainly deny the conclusion, and cry, *They Nestorians? No, they lye in their teeth; they were no more Nestorians than themselves, nor so much neither: And now, good men, they say, It is true, they do represent Christ only by his humane nature in an Image; and when they look on Images, they understand nothing but what signified by them; as when the birth of the Virgin is represented they conceive in their minds, that he who was born, was truly God as well as*

man. Alas for them ! that they should ever be charged with the worship of Images ! They plead for nothing now, but a help to their profound Meditations by them. But the Controversie was about worship, what ever they think and their Adversaries argument did not lye in the Images being considered as an object of perception, but of *worship*: i. e. if the Image can only represent the humane nature of *Christ*, as separate from the divine, and in that respect be an object of *worship* to us, then the charge of *Nestorianism* follows; but they very wisely pass by; and their distinction of the Image from the principal, cannot serve their turn, since the Image receiving the worship due to the principal, must have not only the name, (as they say) but the reason of worship common with the principal which it represents. After this, the Fathers of *Constantinople* proceed to another Argument which is, "That all the representation of *Christ* allowed us by the Gospel, is that which *Christ* himself instituted, in the *Elements* of the *Lords Supper*, whose use was to put us in remembrance of *Christ*. No other Figure or Type being chosen by *Christ* as able to represent his being in the flesh, but this. This was an honourable Image of his quickning body made by himself, say they, which he would not have of the shape of a man to prevent Idolatry; but of a common nature, as he took upon him the common nature of man and not any individuated person; and the body of *Christ*, was really sanctified

“the divine nature ; so by institution this holy  
 “Image is made divine through sanctification  
 “by Grace. Here the *Nicene Council* quarrels  
 with them, for calling the *Eucharist* an Image,  
 contrary, as they say, to the *Scriptures* and *Fa-*  
*thers* ; but they are as much to be believed  
 therein, as in their admirable proofs, that the  
 worship of Images was the constant doctrine of  
 the Church; and having strenuously denied this,  
 they suppose that to be enough to answer the  
 argument.

Besides these particular arguments against  
 the Images of Christ, the Council of Constantinople  
 useth many more against the Images of any  
 other, “Because these being the chief, there  
 “can be less reason for any other besides; that  
 “there is no tradition of Christ or his *Apostles*,  
 “or the primitive *Fathers* for them; no way of  
 “consecration of them prescribed, or practi-  
 “sed, no suitableness in the use of them to  
 “the design of *Christian Religion*, which being  
 “in the middle between *Judaism* and *Paga-*  
 “*nism*, it casts off the *Sacrifices* of the one,  
 “and not only the *Sacrifices*, but all the *Idola-*  
 “*tries* of the other : and it is blasphemy to the  
 “*Saints* in Heaven, to call in the *Heathen* super-  
 “stitious into *Christianity*, to honour them by :  
 “that it is unbecoming their glory in Heaven,  
 “to be set upon earth in dull and senseless  
 “Images ; that Christ himself would not re-  
 “ceive testimony from *Devils*, though they  
 “spake truth ; neither can such a *Heathen-*  
 “*ish* custom be acceptable to the *Saints* in  
 “Heaven, though pretended to be for their  
 H 3 “honour



“honour. That nothing can be plainer in the  
 “*Gospel*, than that *God is a Spirit*, and will be  
 “worshipped in *Spirit and in truth*; to which  
 “nothing can be more contrary, than the going  
 “about to honour *God*, by worshipping any  
 “Image of himself, or his *Saints*. These and  
 many other arguments from the *Scriptures*, and  
*Fathers*, that *Council* insists upon, to shew the  
 incongruity of the worship of *Images*, to the na-  
 ture of *God*, and the design of the *Christian Re-*  
*ligion*; to which the *Council of Nice* returns ve-  
 ry weak & trivial answers, as shall more large-  
 ly appear, if any one thinks good to defend  
 them. And we have this apparent advantage  
 on our side, that although the *Popes of Rome*  
 sided with these worshippers of *Images*, yet the  
*Council at Francfort*, called together by *Charles*  
 the Great condemn’d them: Not out of misun-  
 derstanding their Doctrine, as some vainly ima-  
 gine; because as *Vasquez* well proves, the Copy  
 of the *Nicene Council* was sent to them by *Pope*  
*Adrian*; because the *Acts* of that *Council* were  
 very well known to the Author of the Book,  
 written upon this subject, under the name of  
*Charles the Great*, and published by *du Tillet* at  
*Paris*, about the middle of the last Century,  
 which is acknowledged by their learnedst men  
 to have been written at the same time; because  
 the *Popes Legats Theophylactus*, and *Stephanus*  
 were present, and might easily rectifie any mi-  
 stake, if they were guilty of it; and none of the  
*Historians* of that time, do take notice of any  
 such error among them. But *Vasquez* runs into  
 another strange mistake himself, that the *Council*

*Vasquez in*  
*l. 2 q. 25.*  
*disp. 107.*  
*c. 5.*

of Frankford did not condemn that of Nice; which is evident they did expressly, by the second Canon of that Council published by Sirmondus. And all the objections of Vasquez are taken off by what Sirmondus speaks, of the great authority and antiquity of that MS. from which he published them, and from the consent of the Historians of that time, that the Council of Frankford did reject that of Nice: and Sirmondus saith, they had good reason to deny it to be an Oecumenical Council, where only the Greeks met together, and none of other Provinces were called, or asked their opinion, and Pope Adrian himself he saith, in his defence of it against the Caroline Books, never gives it the name or authority of an Oecumenical Council. The same Council was rejected here in England, as our Historians tell us; because it asserted the adoration of Images, which the Church of God abhors; which are the words of Hoveden and others. And we find afterwards in France by the Synod of Paris, called by Ludovicus Pius upon the Letters of Michael Balbus Emperour of Constantinople, in order, to the Union of Christendom in this point, that these Western Churches persisted still in the condemnation of the Nicene Council; which they would not have done, after so long a time to inform themselves, if a meer mistake of their Doctrine at first, had been the cause of their opposition. But whoever will read the Caroline Books, or the Synod of Paris, or Agobardus and others

Sirmond.  
Concil. Gall.  
To. 2. p. 194.

Spelman.  
Conc. Tom.  
1. p. 306.  
Hoveden  
Annal.  
p. prior. ad  
A. D. 792.  
Simeon Du-  
nel. Histor.  
p. III.  
Marth.  
Westmon.  
A. D. 793.

Caroli Ca-  
pitul. de non  
adorandis  
imaginibus.

Pa. ff. A. D. 1549. & in Gallia. Constit. Imperial. To. 1. Synod. Paris. in Sup-  
plement Concilii Gall. A. D. 824. A. Caroli ope. a Ed. Massoni & Balazii.

about that time, will find that they condemn all religious worship of Images, as *adoration*, and contrary to that honour which is due to God alone, and to the commands which he hath given in *Scripture*. And I extremely wonder how any men of common sense, and much more any of learning and judgment, that had read the Book of *Charles the Great* against the *Nicene Synod*, could imagine it altogether proceeded upon a mistake of the meaning of it; when it so distinctly relates, and punctually answers, the several places of *Scriptures* and *Fathers* produced by it for the worship of Images. In the first Book an answer is given to many impertinent places of the Old Testament, alledged in that *Council*; which the second proceeds with, and examines several testimonies of the *Fathers*; and in the two remaining Books pursues all their pretences with that diligence, that no one can imagine all this while that the Author did not know their meaning. And that by *adoration* he means no more than giving *Religious Worship* to Images appears from hence, because he calls the Civil worship which men give to one another, by the name of *adoration*: when he shews, that it is another thing to give *adoration* to a man upon a *civil respect*, and to give *adoration* to Images upon a *religious account*, when God challenges all *religious worship* or *adoration* to himself: and whatever reason will hold for such a worship of Images will much more hold for the worship of men, who have greater excellency in them, and more honour put upon

caroli liber  
de Imag.  
l. 2. c. 24.

upon them by God, than any Images can ever pretend to. That God allows no other kind of adoration to be given to any but himself, but that which we give to one another. Can any be so senseless to think, that by this *civil adoration*, he meant, we honoured every man we met as our *Sovereign Prince*? And as little reason is there to say, that by *adoration* given to Images, he meant only the incommunicable worship due only to God, in the sense of those *Fathers*. Can we imagine, saith he, that *S. Peter* would allow the worship of Images, who forbad *Cornelius* to worship him! Or *S. John*, whom the Angel checked for offering to worship him, and bid him give that honour to God? Or *Paul* and *Barnabas*, who with such horror ran among the men of *Lycania*, when they were about to worship them; and yet, surely Angels and such persons as these, deserved more to be worshipped than any Images can do. But we see by these examples, that even these are not to be adored with any other kind of adoration, than what the offices of civility require from us. Besides, in his language, those who followed the Council of *Constantinople* are said, not to adore Images; by which nothing else can be meant, than their giving no Religious worship to them, and when he shews the great inconsequence of the Argument from the adoration of the Statues of the Emperours to the adoration of Images, because in matters of Religious Worship we are not to follow the customs of men against the will of God; he thereby shews what kind of adoration he intended, not the worship of

Latria,

C. 25.

C. 31.

L. 3. C. 15.

Concil. Tom.  
5 p. 553.

Tom. 6. p.  
143.

C. 36.

Delaland.  
Suppl. m.  
Concil. Gal.  
p. 109.

*Latria*, but supposed to be of an inferiour sort. In so much, that *Binius* confesseth, *that the design of these Books was against all worship of Images.* It is true, *Pope Hadrian* in the answer he sent to these Books, which is still extant in the *Tomes of the Councils*, doth deny that the *Synod* intended to give proper divine worship to *Images*; but that is no more than the *Synod* it self had in words said before; but that was not the *Question* what they said, but what the nature of the thing did imply? Whether that religious worship they gave to *Images* was not part of that adoration whichs was only due to God? And he that expects an answer to this from him, will find himself deceived; for he is so pitifully put to it for an answer to the demand of any example or word of the *Apostles* to justify *Image-worship*, that he is forced to make use of some *Myistical* passages of *Dionysius* the supposed *Areopagite*, wherein the word *Image* hapning to be, is very sufficient to his purpose. And this answer of *Hadrians* gave so little satisfaction to the *Western Bishops*, that *A. D.* 824. the *Synod at Paris*, being called by *Ludovicus Pius* to advise about this point, did condemn expressly *Pope Hadrian* for asserting a *superstitious adoration of Images*; which they look on as a great *Impiety*, and say that he produces very unpertinent places of the *Fathers*, and remote from his purpose; and that setting aside his *Pontifical Authority*, in his answer to the *Caroline Books*, there were some things apparently false: and they have nothing to excuse him by, but his *Ignorance.* And there-

therefore they at large shew, that the *Regitious worship* of *Images* came first from *Hereticks*; and that it was always condemned by the *Fathers* of the *Christian Church*: and answer the *Arguments* produced on the other side out of the *Writings* of the *Fathers*. And supposing that superstitious custom of worshipping *Images*, had for some time obtained, yet they shew by several testimonies, that it ought to be abrogated. No wonder then that *Bellarmino* Bellarmino. Append. ad lib. de cultu Imag. c. 3. is so much displeased with this *Synod*, for offering so boldly to censure the *Popes Writings*, and a *Synod* approved by him: wherein he saith, they exceed the fault of the *Author of the Caroline Books*: because, as he confesseth, c. 4. they offered to teach the *Pope*, and resisted him to the face. And yet, no doubt, they had read and considered *Hadrians* words, wherein he disowns the giving true divine honour to *Images*. Not long after this *Synod*, came forth the Book of *Agobardus*, *Archbishop* of *Lyons*, against *Images*; occasioned, saith *Papirius Massonus*, by the stupendous superstition in that Age in the worship of them. And this, saith he, is the substance of his Doctrine; out of *S. Augustine* and other *Fathers*; that there is no other Image of *God*, but what is himself, and therefore cannot be painted, and he ought not to be worshipped in any Image, but what he hath prescribed us to worship, which is *Christ*; that adoration is external or internal; that, both of them are called *Religion*, by which we are bound eternally to *God*, and only to him: from whence it follows, that neither *Angels* nor *Saints*



*Saints* are to be worshipped by any *Religious worship* : for this is the *Law of Adoration*, that no creature, no phantasm of *God* in our minds, no work of mens hands ought to be worshipped : for if *Gods* creatures are not to be worshipped, much less ours, such as *Images of God, Angels and Saints* are. Neither is it enough to say, that they do not worship the *Image*, but the *thing* represented ; for the object terminates the worship, and it is a deceit of the *Devil* under the pretence of honouring the *Saints*, to bring mens minds to *Idols*, and from the true *God* to carnal things : that *Images* are to be used only for shew and memory, and not at all for *Religion* ; that *God* alone is to be worshipped with all *Religious worship*, whether called *Latria* or *Doulia*, or what name soever ; and for the casting away all superstition, that no *Images* be painted in *Churches*, no *Statues* erected, nor accounted holy, that the true *God* may be worshipped alone for ever. This is the abstract of his *Doctrine* delivered by *Masfonus*, whose other Writings shew he was far from being partial towards the *Reformation*. And the Book it self is lately published by *Baluzius* again where any one may easily satisfie himself concerning his fidelity. But *Baluzius* very honestly tells us, some have suspected this Book not to be very *Catholick* : and therefore it was censured by *Baronius* and the *Spanish Index* ; yet he ingenuously confesseth, he saith no more than the whole *Gallican Church* believed in that *Age*. What that was, I have already shewed. This I have the more largely

largely insisted upon, to shew, that it is no new thing for us to plead for all *Religious worship* being appropriated to *God*; and that the command against *Image-worship* was no Ceremonial Law, respecting nearly the *Jews*, but that the reason of it doth extend to all *Ages* and *Nations*, and especially to us who live under the *Gospel*. From all which it follows, that it was not nearly the *Heathen Idolatry* which was forbidden by *God*, nor was this Law given barely to prevent, their falling to that by degrees, but the giving to himself such a *Worship*, which he judges so unworthy of him.

§. 10. 3. From those who were best able to *understand* the meaning of it. We can imagine none so competent a Judge of the meaning of a Law, as the *giver* of it; and he afterwards declares the sense of this Law. The first occasion given for knowing the meaning of the Law concerning Images, was not long after the making of it; when upon *Moses* his absence, they compelled *Aaron* to make them a *Golden Calf*. Here was an *Image* made contrary to the Law, as is on all sides acknowledged, but the question is, Whether by this the *Israelites* did fall into the *Heathen Idolatry*, or only worship the true *God* under that *Symbol* of his presence? That they did not herein fall back to the *Heathen Idolatry*, I thus prove: 1. From the occasion of it; which was not upon the least pretence of *Infidelity* as to the true *God*; or that they had now better reason given them, for the worship of other  
Gods

Of the  
Scripture  
Instances  
of Idolatry  
contrary  
to the se-  
cond Com-  
mandment.

Exo. 32. 4.

*Gods besides him : but all they say , was , that Moses had been so long absent ; they knew not what was become of him , and therefore they say to Aaron , make us Gods (or a God, as in Neh. 9. 18.) to go before us. We cannot imagine the people so foolish , to desire Aaron to make them a God in the proper sense ; as though they could believe the Calf newly made , to have been the God , which before it was made , brought them out of the Land of Egypt , as they say afterwards, v. 4. but it must be understood as the symbol of that God which did bring them from thence. The controversie then lies here, Whether they thought the Egyptian Gods delivered them out of Egypt, while they forsook all their own Worshippers, to persevere those who were so great enemies to them , that their very way of worship was an abomination to all the Egyptians , and whether they could think the Gods of Egypt had wrought all the Miracles for them, in their deliverance, and after it? Whether they appeared not long before on Mount Sinai, and delivered the Law to them? Or , whether it were not the true God they meant , who had made that the Preface to his Laws, I am the God that brought thee out of the Land of Egypt , to whom they intended still to give honor : But the only question was concerning the symbol of his presence , that was to go before them. For which , we are to consider, that immediately before Moses his going up into the Mount, the last promise God made to them was, that he would send his Angel before them ; which is else-  
 where called his presence. Moreover, they understood*

Exod. 8. 26

Exod. 23.

20, 23.

Exo. 33. 34

derstood that there should be some extraordinary *symbol* of this presence; but what it was, they could not tell; for *Moses* was then gone into the Mount to learn: but he not being heard of in forty days, they took it for granted, they should never hear of him any more; therefore they fall upon devising among themselves, what was the fittest *symbol* for the presence of *God* going before them; and herein the greatest number being possessed with the prejudices of their education in *Egypt*, where golden *Bulls* were the symbols of their chief *God Osiris*, they pitch upon that, and force *Aaron* to a compliance with them in it.<sup>2</sup> There is no intimation given in the whole story, that they fell into the *Heathen Idolatry*; for when afterwards they fell into it, the particular names of the *Gods* are mentioned, as *Baal-peor*, *Moloch*, *Remphan*. But here on the contrary, *Aaron* expressly proclaims a feast to the Lord, and the people accordingly met, and offered their accustomed offerings; whereas if it had been the *Egyptian Idolatry*, their common Sacrifices were abominations; they must not have sacrificed *Sheep* and *Oxen*, as they were wont to do. And that it was not the *Idolatry* of other Nations, who worshiped the *Host of Heaven*, is plain from *S. Stephens* words, And they made a *Calf* in those days, and offered Sacrifice unto *Idols*, and rejoiced in the works of their own hands; then *God* turned, and gave them up to worship the *Host of Heaven*. Whereby it is both observable that the *Idolatry* of the *Calf* was distinct from the other *Heathen Idolatry*,

Num. 25.3.

Acts 7.43.

Exod. 32.5.

Verse 6.

Acts 7.

41, 42.

latry, this being a punishment of the other; and withal, though the *Calf* was intended by them, to be only a symbol of *Gods* presence, yet being directly against *Gods* Command, and having Divine worship given it, it is by *S. Stephen* called an *Idol*; and to the same purpose the *Psalmist* speaks, *They made a Calf in Horeb, and worshiped the Molten Image; thus they changed their glory (or rather his) into the similitude of an Ox that eateth grass.* Which certainly was *Idolatry*, as well as that *S. Paul* charges the *Romans* with, viz. that they changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible Man, and to Birds, and four footed Beasts, and Creeping things. And we see how highly God was displeased with the *Israelites* for this sin of the golden *Calf*, *Exod.* 32.7,8,9,10.

*Psal.* 106.  
19, 20.

*Rom.* 1.23.

*1 King.* 11.  
33.

*Ibid.*

*1 King.* 16.  
31.  
*1 King.* 11.  
28, 29.

The same may be said of the two *Calves* of *Jeroboam*, at *Dan* and *Bethel*; for it was neither agreeable to his end, nor so likely to succeed, to take the ten Tribes off from the Worship of the true God, but only from the place of it at *Hierusalem*; and the occasion of the Kingdoms coming to him was from *Solomon's* falling to *Heathen Idolatry*: Which would make him more cautious of falling into it, especially at his first entrance: And when the gods of other Nations are mentioned, they are particularly described, as *Ashteroth* of the *Zodonians*, *Chemosh* of the *Moabites*, and *Milcom* of the *Children of Ammon*. And in *Abahs* Idolatry, the occasion and description of it is given: But of *Jeroboam* it is only said that he set up the *Calves* at

Dan and Bethel, and said unto the people; It is too much for you to go up to Hierusalem, behold thy Gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the Land of Egypt. How ealie had it been to have said that Jeroboam worshiped the Gods of Egypt, if that had been his intention? but, how much better that he then argued, that they had been hitherto in a great mistake concerning the true God, and not meerly as to the place of his Worship; which is all he speaks against: for he continued the same Feasts and way of Worship, which were at Hierusalem. Besides, how comes the sin of Ahab to be so much greater than that of Jeroboam, if they were both guilty of the same Apostasie to Heathen Idolatry? How came the Worship of the true God in the Ten Tribes to be set in opposition to Heathen Idolatry? how comes Jehu at the same time to boast his zeal for the Lord, when it is said of him, that he departed not from the sins of Jeroboam, viz. The golden Calves of Dan and Bethel? Lastly, how comes the Worship of the true God to be preserved in the Ten Tribes after their Captivity, when they still continued their separation in Religion from the Kingdom of Judah? For, certainly, if the Samaritans had only desired information concerning the Worship of the God of Israel, after the way of Hierusalem, they would have sent only thither for it; but because they sent into the Land of their Captivity, for a Priest to be sent to them; it is plain the former differences still continued, and yet it is said, he taught them to

1 King. 12.

32.

1 King. 16.

31.

1 King. 18.

21.

2 King. 10.

16. 29. 2.

2 King. 17.

28.



1 Kin. 14. 9 *fear the Lord.* And notwithstanding it be thus evident, that *Jeroboam* did not fall then into *Heathen Idolatry*, yet we see that he is charged with *Idolatry* in Scripture, for it is said, *that he had done evil above all that were before him, and had gone and made him other Gods and Molten Images to provoke God to anger, and had cast him behind his back.* From whence it necessarily follows, that if *God* may be allowed to interpret his own *Law*, the *Worshipping of Images*, though designed for his honor is *Idolatry*.

And since the *Lawgiver* hath thus interpreted his own *Law*, we need not be solicitous about the sense of any others; yet herein we have the concurrence of the *Jewish* and *Christian Church*: the *Jews* have thought the prohibition to extend to all kinds of *Images* for *Worship*, and almost all for *ornament*: and the *Image worship* of the *Church of Rome* is one of the great scandals to this day, which hinder them from embracing *Christianity*. The primitive *Christians* were declared enemies to all *Worship of God by Images*; but I need the less to go about to prove it now, since it is at last confessed by one of the most learned *Jesuits* they ever had, that for the four first Centuries and further, there was little or no use of *Images* in the *Temples* or *Oratories* of *Christians*; but we need not their favour in so plain a cause as this; as shall be evidently proved if occasion be further given. And against my Adversaries opinion, that the second Command only forbids the *Worship of Idols*, we have the consent of some

*Petav. dogmat. Theol. To. 5. l. 15. c. 13. s. 3. c. 14. s. 8.*

some of the most learned Writers of his own Church: For *Vasquez* acknowledgeth, that it is plain in Scripture that God did not only forbid that in the second Command, which was unlawful by the Law of Nature, as the Worshipping an Image for God; but the Worshipping of the true God by any similitude of him; and he reckons up many others, of the same opinion with him; of great estimation in the Roman Church.

§. 11. But we must now consider, what he further produces for his opinion; he therefore saith, If *S. Austins* judgment be to be followed, the second Commandment is but a part or explication of the first. But why doth he not tell us, whether *S. Austins* judgment be to be followed or no, if it be of so much consequence to the resolving of this Controversie? Nay how is he sure this was *S. Austins* constant judgment; since in his latter Writings, he reckons up the Commandments as others of the Fathers had done before him? But if *S. Austins* judgment were to be followed in this, doth it thence follow that this Commandment must be only against *Idols*? no, but that all things concerning the Worship of God must be in one command; and so they may be, and yet be as full against *Image-worship*, as in two: so, that no relief is to be had from hence.

And as little from his distinction of an inferior and relative honour only, which is given by them (he saith) to the Sacred Images of Christ, and his B. Mother and Saints; and that which they call *Latria* or Worship due to God; the

*Vasquez. in*  
3. Thom.  
disp. 94. q.  
25. c. 3.

Of the distinctions used to excuse this from being Idolatry.  
*Aug. c. duas*  
*Epist. Pet.*  
l. 3. c. 4.

B Andrews  
Answer to  
Perron p. 57

former, he saith, is only honorary adoration expressed by putting off our Hats, kissing them, or kneeling before them. Which is just as if an unchaste Wife should plead in her excuse to her Husband, that the person she was too kind with, was extremely like him, and a near friend of his, and that it was out of respect to him that she gave him the honour of his bed; Can any one think that such an excuse as this would be taken by a jealous Husband? How much less will such like pretences avail with that God, who hath declared himself particularly jealous of his honour; in this Command above others, and that *he will not give his glory to another*, but hath reserved all *Divine worship* as peculiar to himself; and no such fond excuses of *relative, inferiour, and improper Worship* will serve, when they encroach upon his Prerogative. It was well observed, by a very learned Bishop of our Church, that such kind of distinctions so applied are like the dispute among some of the Church of Rome in Scotland, whether the *Lords Prayer* might be used to *Saints* or no, and it was well resolved and very subtilly, that *ultimately, principally, primarily and strictly* they might not, but *secondarily, less principally, and largely or relatively* they might. The same would certainly hold for Images too. And I wonder very much, they stick at any kind of Worship to be done to *Images*. For my own part, were I of their mind, I should as little scruple offering up the *Host* to an *Image*, as saying my *Prayers* to it, and I should think my self hardly dealt with, if I did not come off with the

the same distinctions. For if I do it to *God absolutely*, and for *himself*, and to the Image only *improperly* and *relatively*, wherein am I to blame? I cannot understand, if the Image have the *honorary adoration*, as he calls it, given to it only with a respect to what is represented by it, but I may give the same kind of Worship to the Image which I do to the *Prototype*: and that, upon the rule he quotes from *S. Basil* (although he uses it quite upon another occasion, as if he looks upon the place he may see) *that the Worship of the Image is carried to the Prototype or thing represented*. I desire therefore seriously to know of him, whether any *Worship* doth at all belong to the *Image* or no? if none at all, to what end are they *kneeling before* and *kissed*, which if the Images had any sense in them, they would think was done to them? And why doth the *Council of Trent* determine that *due worship* is to be given them? If there be any *due*, whether is it the *same* that is given to the *Prototype*, or *distinct* from it; if it be the *same*, then proper *Divine worship* is given to the *Image*; if *distinct*, then the *Image* is worshipped with *Divine Worship* for *it self*, and not *relatively* and *subordinately*, as he speaks.

I know, *Madam*, when any thing pincheth them, they cry presently these are *disputes of the Schools*, and *Niceties* too deep for you to be able to judge of; but I assure you some of the best learned among them, have determined which side soever you take you fall into *Idolatry*; and I hope that is no *Sch-Lattick nicety* with you. I shall endeavour to give you their

Bellarmin. de  
im. g. l. 2.  
c. 24.

sense as plainly as I can. *Bellarmin* saith,  
 "That no Image is to be Worshipped pro-  
 "perly with that Worship which the thing  
 "represented is worshipped by ; for *Latria* (as  
 "he calls it ) is a Worship proper to God,  
 "but no Image upon account of relation, or  
 "any other way is God; therefore that *Worship*  
 "doth not belong to it. It may be, saith he,  
 "some will say, that *Latria* is a *Worship* proper  
 "to God, when it is given for it self, and not for  
 "another ( or relatively. ) I Answer, that it is  
 "of the Nature of *Latria* (or *Divine Worship*)  
 "to be given for it self : for , that is the wor-  
 "ship, which is due to the true God as the  
 "first principle of all things, and it implies a  
 "contradiction for the highest worship to be  
 "given to the first principle, and relatively or  
 "for another ; and therefore this worship is  
 "given to the Image for it self, which is  
 "plain *Idolatry*; or else it is not given for it  
 "self, and then it is not *Latria* or properly Di-  
 "vine worship. Again, either the Divine wor-  
 "ship, or *Latria*, which is given to the Image  
 "relatively for another, is the same with that  
 "which is given to God, or an inferior wor-  
 "ship, if it be the same, the Creature is equally  
 "worshipped with God, which certainly is *Ido-*  
 "*latry* ; For *Idolatry*, (saith he) is not only when  
 "God is forsaken, and an Idol worshipped,  
 "but when an Idol is worshipped together with  
 "God. If it be an inferior worship, then it is  
 "not *Latria*, for that is the highest Worship.  
 "Thus far *Bellarmin* : On the other side *Vasquez*  
 "a *Jesuit*, a man of great reputation too, and  
 of

*Vasquez*. 3.  
*Th. disp.*  
108. q. 25.  
art. 3. c. 9.

of as searching a wit as *Bellarmin*, he saith,  
 "That if an *inferior Worship* be given to the  
 "*Image*, distinct from that which is given to  
 "the thing represented, he that so gives it in-  
 "cure the *crime of Idolatry*; for he expresth  
 "his submission to a mear inanimate thing, that  
 "hath no kind of excellency to deserve it from  
 "him. By which we see that it is in mens  
 choice what sort of *Idolatry* they will commit,  
 who worship *Images*; but in neither way they  
 can avoid it.

§. 12. But yet he thinks to escape by some parallel instances, as he fancies them; such as, the honour given to the *Chair of State*, or the *Kings Picture or Garment*; *Moses and Joshua's putting of their shoes, because it was holy ground*; the *Jews falling down before Gods footstool*, and worshipping the *Holies of Holies*, where were the *Cherubims, Propitiatory, and Ark*; *Protestants bowing at the name of Jesus*, or *kneeling at the Eucharist*, and *bowing before the Altar*; from these he thinks he hath sufficiently cleared, that inferior and relative worship which they give to *Images*. To which I answer,

1. To that of the *Chair of State*; that our dispute is not concerning *Civil worship*, but *Divine*; and as to *Civil Worship*, I suppose he would not say, that were any honour to the *King*, in case he had absolutely forbidden it, as we have proved *God* hath done in the case of *Images*.

2. To the putting off the shoes upon holy ground: (1.) That we think there is some little difference to be made between what *God* hath

The in-  
 stances  
 supposed  
 to be pa-  
 rallel  
 answered.



Exod. 3. 5. *commanded*, and what he hath *forbidden*; for  
 Josh. 5. 15. in the case of *Moses* and *Joshua*, there was an  
*express command*; but in the case of *Image-*  
*worship* there is as plain a *prohibition*. (2.) That  
 the special presence and appearance of *God*  
 doth *sanctifie* a place to so high a degree, that  
 we may lawfully testify our reverence towards  
 it; but this will not hold for *Images*, unless  
*God* be proved present in them, in the same  
 manner as he appeared to *Moses* and *Joshua*;  
 and yet even then, the reverence he required  
 was not *kissing it*, or *bowing to it*, much less  
*praying to it*, but only *putting off their shoes*. (3.)  
 If these things had been done towards the  
*ground*, the danger had not been so great as to  
*Images*; because the *ground* had nothing of *Re-*  
*presentation* in it, but was only *Sacred* by *Di-*  
*vine Consecration*; and therefore it could not pre-  
 tend, to be any *similitude* of *God*. But in *Images*  
 there is nothing *Sacred*, but being an *Image*; and  
 so the *Representation* is that, which gives all the  
 excellency and value to it, and therefore the *Re-*  
*verence* of holy places and things, is of quite a  
 different nature from the *Worship* of *Images*.

3. To the *Jews* adoration towards the *Ark*  
 and the *Holy of Holies*, where the *Cherubims*  
 and *Propitiatory* were: (1.) That they only di-  
 rected their *Worship* towards the place, where  
*God* had promised to be *signally present* among  
 them; which signifies no more to the *Worship*  
 of *Images*, than our lifting our eyes to *Heaven*,  
 doth when we pray, because *God* is more espe-  
 cially present there. (2.) That though  
 the *Cherubims* were there, yet they were al-  
 ways

ways hid from the sight of the people; the High-Priest himself going into the *Holy of Holies* but once a year; that the *Cherubims* were no representations of God; and his Throne was between them upon the *mercy seat*; and they were *Hieroglyphical figures* of Gods own appointing which the *Jews* know no more than we do: which are plain arguments they were never intended for *objects of worship*; for then, they must not have been meerly *appendices* to another thing, they must have been publickly exposed, as the *Images* are in the *Roman Churches*, and their form as well known as any of the *B. Virgin*.

4. To bowing at the name of *Jesus*; that he might as well have instanced in going to Church at the toll of a bell, for as the one only tells us the time when we ought to go to Worship God; so the mentioning the name of *Jesus* doth only put us in mind of him we owe all manner of reverence to, without dishonouring him as the *object* of our Worship, by any *Image* of him, which can only represent that which is neither the *object* nor *reason* of our Worship.

5. To kneeling at the *Eucharist*, that of all things should not be objected to us, who have declared in our *Rubrick* after *Communion*,  
 "That thereby no adoration is intended or  
 "ought to be done either unto the Sacramental  
 "Bread and Wine, there bodily received, or  
 "any corporal presence of Christs natural  
 "Flesh and Blood; for the Sacramental Bread  
 "and Wine remain still in their very natural  
 "substances, and therefore may not be adored;  
 "for

“for that were *Idolatry* to be abhorred of all  
“faithful Christians.

*To bowing towards the Altar, or at entring in  
and going out of the Church, that it is of the  
same nature with the putting off our Hats,  
while we are there; and is only determining a  
natural act of Reverence, that way which the  
ancient Christians did use to direct their Wor-  
ship.*

---

CHAP.

---

## CHAP. II.

*Of their Idolatry in Adoration of the Host,  
and Invocation of Saints.*

The Argument proposed, concerning the Adoration of the Host; the insufficiency of the Answer to it manifested: supposing equal revelation for Transubstantiation as for Christs Divinity, yet not the same reason for Worshipping the Host as the person of Christ; the great disparity between these two at large discovered; the Controversie truly stated, concerning Adoration of the Host: and it is proved, that no man, on the principles of the Roman Church, can be secure he doth not commit Idolatry in it. The confession of our Adversaries, that the same Principles will justify the Worship of any Creature. No such motives to believe Transubstantiation as the Divinity of Christ. Bishop Taylor's Testimony answered by himself. To Worship Christ in the Sun, as lawful as to Worship him in the Host. The grossest Idolatry excusable; on the same grounds. The argument proposed and vindicated, concerning the Invocation of Saints practised in the Church of Rome. The Fathers Arguments against the Heathens, hold against Invocation of Saints; the state of the Controversy, about Idolatry, as managed by them. They make it wholly unlawful, to give divine Worship to any Creature, how excellent soever. The Worship, not only of Heathen Gods, but of Angels

*Angels condemned. The common evasions answered. Prayer more proper to God, than Sacrifice. No such disparity as is pretended, between the manner of Invocating Saints, and the Heathens Invocating their Deities. In the Church of Rome, they do more than pray to Saints to pray for them, proved from the present most Authentick Breviaries. Supposing that were all, it would not excuse them. St. Austin no friend to Invocation of Saints. Practices condemned by the Church pleaded for it. Of Negative points being Articles of faith.*

Of the  
Adoration  
of the  
Host:

§. 1. **I** Proceeded to the Adoration of the Host; and here the Argument I proposed, was, to take off the common answer; That this could not be Idolatry, because they believed the Bread to be God, upon the same ground, I said, they who believe the Sun to be God, and Worship him on that account, would be excused from Idolatry too; nay the grosser their Idolatry was, the more excusable it would be; as that of those who suppose their Images to be Gods, and upon this ground their Worship was more Lawful than of those who supposed them not to be so. To this he answers two ways; 1. That they do not barely suppose, that the substance of bread is changed into Christs body, and that he is really present under the form of Bread; but that they know and believe this, upon the same grounds and motives upon which they believe that Christ is God; and consequently to be adored; and further adds, that the same argument will hold against the adoration of Christ as God, as against the adoration of him in the

the Eucharist, since they have a like Divine Revelation for his real presence under the Sacramental signs, as for his being true God and man.

2. Supposing they were mistaken, yet it would not follow they were Idolaters, which he proves from Dr. Taylors words. But notwithstanding these appearances of answering, that my argument still stands good, will be evident by proving these things. 1. That supposing there were the same revelation of Christs Divinity, and of his presence in the Eucharist by Transubstantiation, yet there could not be the same reason for the Adoration of the Host, as for worshipping Christ himself. 2. That there are not the same motives and grounds to believe that Doctrine of Transubstantiation, that there are to believe that Christ is God. 3. That supposing they are mistaken in the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, that doth not excuse them from Idolatry. 4. That the same reason which would excuse them, would excuse the most gross Idolaters in the World.

§. 2. That supposing there were the same divine revelation of Transubstantiation & of Christs Divinity, yet there could not be the same reason for adoration of the Host as of Christ himself.

1. Because there is a plain command in Scripture for one, and there is nothing like it for the other.

All the Angels are commanded to Worship the Son of God; and much more all men, who have greater obligation to do it. All men are to honour the Son as they honour the Father; and to his name every knee is to bow: But where is there the least intimation given that we are

Heb. 1. 6.

Joh. 5. 23.

Phil. 2. 10.



to Worship *Christ* in the *Elements* supposing him present there? If it be said, *the general command doth extend to him, where-ever he is present*; It is easily answered, that this argument doth prove no more his *Worship* in the *Elements*, than in a *turf*, or any other piece of *bread*; for *Christ* being *God* is every where present; and if his presence only may be ground of giving *adoration* to that wherein he is present, we may as lawfully Worship the *Sun*, or the *Earth* or any other thing, as they do the *Sacrament*. For he is present in all of them. But our *Worship* is not to be guided by our own Fancies, but the will of *God*; and we have a *command* for worshipping of the person of *Christ*, and till we see one as to his presence in the *Sacrament*, we ought not to think the one parallel with the other. And by this the weakness of his retorting the argument in the *Arrians* behalf (so he calls those who believe *Christ* to be a pure man) against those who Worship the Son of *God* will appear: for our *Worship* doth not meerly depend upon our belief, but upon the *divine command*; and therefore those who have denied the one, have yet contended for the other.

2. The one gives us a sufficient reason for our *Worship*, but the other doth not: There can be no greater reason for giving his person *adoration* than that he is the *eternal Son of God*; but what equivalent reason to this is there, supposing the *bread* to be really converted into the *body of Christ*; All that I can believe then present is the *body of Christ*; and what then? is that the object of our *adoration*? do we terminate our

Worship

Worship upon his humane nature ? and was it ever more properly so than in *dying* ? is it not the death of *Christ* that is set forth in the *Eucharist* ? And is his body present any other way, than as it is agreeable to the end of the *institution* ? But it may be they will say *the body of Christ being hypostatically united with the divine nature, one cannot be present without the other*, That indeed is a good argument to prove the body of *Christ* cannot be there by *Transubstantiation* : for if the bread be converted into that body of *Christ* which is *hypostatically* united with the *divine nature*, then the conversion is not merely into the *body* : but into the *Person* of *Christ* ; and then *Christ* hath as many bodies *hypostatically* united to him, as there are *Elements* Consecrated ; and so all the accidents of the *bread* belong to that *body of Christ*, which is *hypostatically* united with the *divine nature*. Nay to make the *Elements* the object of *divine worship*, as they do, they must suppose an *hypostatical union* between *them* and the *divine nature* of *Christ* ; for if the only reason of joyning the *humane nature* with the *divine* in the *person* of *Christ*, as the object of our *Worship*, be the *hypostatical union* of those *Natures* ; then we can upon no other account make those *Elements* the object of *Worship*, but by supposing such an *union* between *Christ* and *them*. But I suppose they will not venture to say, that *Christ* is *hypostatically* united with the *shape, figure and colour* of the *bread* : for they will have nothing else to remain after Consecration ( in spite of all the reason and sense

Council. Tri-  
dent. Sess.  
23. c. 5.

sense of the world) but meerly those accidents; and the Council of Trent determines That the same Divine Worship which we give to God himself, is in express terms to be given to the most holy Sacrament, and pronounces an *Anathema* against all who deny it. And what is the holy Sacrament but the body of Christ, according to them under the accidents of the bread; and although the body of Christ being believed to be there, is the reason of their Worship; yet the Worship is given to the Elements upon that account.

The state  
of the  
Contro-  
versie.

§. 3. But this being a matter of so great importance, to make it as clear as the nature of the thing will allow, I shall yet further prove, that upon the principles of the Roman Church, no man can be assured that he doth not commit Idolatry every time he gives adoration to the Host; and I hope this will abundantly add to the discovering the disparity between the Worship given to the person of Christ, and that which is given to the Eucharist upon supposition of Transubstantiation. But before I come to this, I shall endeavour to give a true account of the State of the Controversie between us: which I shall do in these particulars.

I. The Question between us is not, whether the person of Christ, is to be worshiped with divine worship; for that we freely acknowledge. And although the humane nature of Christ, of it self, can yield us no sufficient reason for adoration, yet being considered as united to the divine nature, that cannot hinder the same divine Worship being given to his person, which

which belongs to his divine nature ; any more than the *Robes* of a *Prince*, can take off from the honour due unto him.

2. It is not, whether the *person* of *Christ*, *visibly appearing* to us in any place, ought to have *divine honour* given to him? For supposing sufficient evidence of such an *appearance*, we make no more question of this, than we do of the former. Neither do we say, that we need a particular *command* in such a case to make it lawful ; any more than the *Patriarchs* did at every appearance of *God* among them ; or those who conversed with our *Lord* on earth, every time they fell down and Worshipped him. Where our sense and reason is satisfied as well as *St. Thomas's* was in a *visible appearance* of *Christ*, we can give *divine Worship* as he did, when he said *My Lord and my God* ; for in this *Worship* given to the *Person* of *Christ*, I am sure I give it to nothing, but what is either *God* or *hypostatically united* to the divine nature : But is there not the same reason of believing *Christ* to be present, as of seeing him? I answer, in matters of pure revelation there is, where the matter proposed to our faith can be no object of sense ; as *Christ's* infinite presence in all places as *God*, I firmly believe upon the credit of divine revelation, and I give divine *Worship* to him as *God*, suitable to that *infinite presence* ; but our question is, concerning the *visible presence* of *Christ*, where honour is given on the account of the divine nature, but he can be known to be present only by his *humanity* ; in this case I say, the evidence of sense is necessary in order to the true *Worshipping*

the person of *Christ*. If any should be so impertinent as to urge that saying to this purpose, *Joh. 20. 29. blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed*, I shall only say, that doth not at all relate to this matter, but to the truth of *Christ's* resurrection.

3. It is not concerning the *spiritual Worship* of *Christ*, in the Celebration of the *Eucharist*: For we declare that in all solemn acts of *Religious Worship*, and particularly in the *Eucharist*, we give divine honour to the *Son of God*, as well as to the *Father*. We affirm, that we ought not only perform the offices of *Religion* out of obedience to his divine commands, but with a due Veneration of his *Majesty* and power, with thankfulness for his infinite goodness, and with trust in his promises, and subjection of our souls to his supreme *Authority*. About these things, which are the main parts of divine and spiritual *Worship*, we have no quarrel; nor do we find fault with any for giving too much to *Christ* in this manner; but rather for placing too much in the bare external acts of *adoration*, which may be performed with all external pomp and shew, where there is no inward reverence nor sincere devotion. And yet,

4. It is not, concerning external *Reverence* to be shewn in the time of receiving the *Eucharist*: For that our *Church* not only allows, but enjoins; and that not barely for the avoiding such *profanation and disorder in the holy Communion*, as might otherwise ensue, but for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgement of the benefit of *Christ* therein given to all worthy receivers.

But

Rubrick  
after Com-  
munion.

But it is withal declared, *that thereby no Adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christs natural flesh and blood*; as I have already recited it. But the Controversie, concerning the adoration of the *Host*, lyes in these two things.

1. Whether proper *divine Worship*, in the time of receiving the *Eucharist*, may be given to the *Elements*, on the account of a *corporal presence of Christ* under them? 2. Whether out of the time of receiving, the same *adoration* ought to be given to it, when it is *elevated* or *carried in procession*, which we would give to the very *person of Christ*? And that this is the true state of the Controversie, I appeal to the doctrine and practice of the *Roman Church* in this point. For it is expressly determined by the *Council of Trent*, *That there is no manner of doubt left, but that all Christians ought to give the same Worship to this holy Sacrament which they give to God himself. For it is not therefore less to be Worshipped, because it was instituted by Christ our Lord that it might be taken.* By which words the true state of the Controversie is made evident, which is not about the reverence due only to *Christ*, supposed to be *corporally present* there, but the *adoration* due to the *Sacrament* upon that account. And by the *Sacrament* the *Council* must understand the *elements* or *accidents* (or whatever name they call them by) as the immediate *term* of that *divine Worship*, or else the latter words signifie nothing at all. For what was that, *which was instituted by our*

*Council. Tri-*  
*dent. sess. 13.*  
*c. 5.*



Lord as a Sacrament? was it not the external and visible signs or elements? why do they urge, that the Sacrament ought not the less to be adored because it was to be taken, but to take off the common objection that we ought not to give divine Worship to that which we eat? And what can this have respect to but the Elements? But this is not deny'd, that I know of, by any who understand either the doctrine or practice of that Church; although to answer our Arguments they would seem to direct their Worship only to Christ, as present under the elements; yet yielding that on the account of this corporal presence, that which appears, ought to have the same Worship given to it, with that which is supposed or believed. And so they make the accidents of the Sacrament to have the very same honour, which the humane nature of Christ hath; which they say hath no divine honour for it self, but on the account of the conjunction of the divinity with it.

No security in the Roman Church against Idolatry in Adoration of the Host.

§. 4. The Controversie being thus stated, I come to shew, that upon the Principles of the Roman Church, no man can be assured that he doth not commit Idolatry, every time he gives Adoration to the Host. For it is a principle indisputable among them, that to give proper divine honour, called by them Adoration, to a creature, is Idolatry; but no man, upon the principles of their Church, can be assured every time he Worships the Host, that he doth not give proper divine honour to a creature. For there are two things absolutely necessary, to secure a mans mind in the performance of

of an act of divine Worship. 1. That either the *object* be such in it self, which deserves and requires such Worship from us as is the *divine nature of Christ*: Or, 2. That if of it self, it doth not deserve it, there be a *reason* sufficient to give it, as in the *humane nature of Christ* upon its *union* with the *Divine*: but in this matter, of the *adoration* of the *Host*, no man can be secure of either of these, upon their own Principles.

1. He cannot be secure that the *object* is such, as doth deserve *divine worship*. If a man should chance to believe his senses, or hearken to his reason, or at least think the matter disputable; whether that which he sees to be *bread*, be not really *bread*, what case is this man in? He becomes an *Idolater* by not being a *fool* or a *mad man*. But because we are not now to proceed upon the principles of *sense* or *reason*, but those of the *Church of Rome*; I will suppose the case of one that goes firmly upon the received principles of it, and try whether such a one can be satisfied in his mind, that when he gives *divine worship* to the *Host*, he doth not give it to a *creature*. And because we are now supposing unreasonable things, I will suppose my self to be that person. The *Mass-bell* now rings, and I must give the same *divine honour* to the *Host*, which I do to *Christ* himself: but hold, if it should be but a *meer creature*, all the world cannot excuse me from *Idolatri*, and my own *Church* condemns me; all agreeing that this is gross *Idolatri*; how come I then to be assured, that what but a

little before was a meer creature, is upon the pronouncing a few words turned into my Creator. A strange and sudden change! And I can hardly say, that *God* becoming *man* was so great a wonder, as a little piece of *bread* becoming *God*. When *God* became man, he shewed himself to be *God*, by Wonders and Miracles which he wrought for the conviction of the world: I will see if I can find any such evidence of so wonderful a *transformation* from a *Wafer* to a *Deity*. I see it to be the very *same* it was, I handle it as I did, if I taste it, it hath the very *same* agreeableness to the *Palat* it had; Where then lies this mighty *change*? But *O carnal reason*, what have I to do with thee in these *mysteriæ* of *faith*! I remember what *Church* I am of, and how much I am bid to beware of *thee*: but how then shall I be satisfied? Must I rely on the bare words of *Christ*, *This is my body*? But I have been told, the *Scripture* is very obscure and dangerous for me to be too confident of the *sense* of it. I have heard some wise men of our *Church* have said, that these words may bear a *figurative sense*, like *that rock was Christ*, and that if there were no other evidence for *Transubstantiation*, but what the *Scripture* gives, there were no reason to make it an Article of *faith*. I have heard the great names of *Scorus*, *Aliaco*, *Biel*, *Fisher*, *Cajetan*, *Canus* and others quoted to this purpose, and their testimonies produced. What a case am I in then, if those words do not prove it? Now I think better of it, I must trust the *Church* for the *sense* of *Scripture*; and if

if I be not strangely mistaken, I am sworn to interpret *Scripture* according to the *unanimous consent of the Fathers* : but alas, what relief is this to my anxious mind ? This is a thing I am to do, or not to do, almost every day ; and to be resolved of it, I am put to a task which will hold me all my life time : and may be as unsatisfied at last as I am now. For I see the world is full of Disputes, concerning the sense of their words, as well as the *Scriptures* : One saith, that a Father by a *figure* means a *substance*; and that another by a *substance* means a *figure* ; one man says his adversaries authorities are *counterfeit*, and another says the same of his : one quotes the saying of an *Heretick* for the *Orthodox* ; and another makes it appear, that if he spake his own mind, he must contradict himself and others of the *Fathers*. One produces a *Pope* confirming the Doctrine of *transubstantiation*, and another as plain a testimony of another *Pope*, of greater antiquity and more learning, overthrowing it. One appeals to the first Ages of the *Church*, another to the latest : one saith, the *Fathers* spake *Rhetorically*, and another, *Dogmatically*. One, that they loved to talk *mystically*, and another, that they spake *differently* about this matter. In this great confusion what ground of certainty have I to stand upon, whereby to secure my mind from commission of a great sin ? I am sure if I live in willful sin all my days, I shall be damned ; but *God* hath never told me, if I do not study the *Fathers* all my life, I shall be damned. It is *satisfaction* I desire, and that I am not like

to have this way, when I see men of greater Wit, and Subtlety, and Judgement, than ever I am like to come to, are still disputing about the sense of the Fathers in this point: Witness the late heats in *France* about it. While I am in this *Labyrinth* a kind *Priest* offers to give me ease, and tells me, these are doubts and scruples I ought not to trouble my self about, the authority of the present *Church* is sufficient for me: I thank him for his kindness, only desiring to know, what he means by the authority of the present *Church*: For I find we *Catholicks* are not agreed about that neither. May I be sure, if the *Pope* who is *Head of the Church* say it? No, not unless he *defines* it: but may I be sure then? No, not unless a *General Council* concur: but may I be sure, if a *General Council* determines it? Yea, if it be confirmed *wholly* by the *Pope*, and doth proceed *in the way of a Council*: but how is it possible for me to judge of that, when the intrigues of actions are so secret? I see then, if this be the only way of satisfaction, I must forbear giving adoration, or be guilty of *Idolatry* in doing it. But suppose I am satisfied in the point of *transubstantiation*, it is not enough for me to know in general, that there is such a *change*; but I must believe particularly that very *bread* to be *changed* so, which I am now to worship, and by what means can I be sure of that? For my *Church* tells me, that it is necessary that he be a *Priest* that consecrates, and that he had an *intention* of consecrating that very *bread* which I am to adore. But what if it should come to pass  
after

after many consecrations, that such a person prove no *Priest*, because not rightly *baptized*; ( which is no unheard of thing ) what became of all their actions who worshipped every *Host* he pretended to consecrate? They must be guilty of *Idolatry*, every *Mass* he celebrated. But how is it possible for me to be sure of his *Priesthood*, unless I could be sure of the *intention* of the *Bishop* that *ordained* him, and the *Priest* that *baptized* him? which it is impossible for me to be. Yet suppose I were sure he was a *Priest*, what assurance have I, that he had an intention to consecrate that very *Waser* which I am to adore? If there were thirteen, and he had an intention to consecrate only twelve, if I worship the thirteenth, I give *divine honor* to a *meer creature*; for without the *intention* of the *Priest* in consecration, it can be nothing else; and then I am guilty of downright *Idolatry*. So that upon the principles of the *Roman Church*, no man can be satisfied, that he doth not worship a *meer Creature* with *divine honor*, when he gives *adoration* to the *Host*.

2. No man can be satisfied that he hath *sufficient reason* for giving this *worship* to the *Host*. For which we must consider, what *suppositions* the *adoration* of the *Host* depends upon, if any of which prove uncertain, I am in as bad a case as I was before. I first suppose, that the bread being really and substantially changed into that very *body of Christ* which was crucified at *Hierusalem*, I ought to give the same *honour* to that *body* of



of *Christ* in the *Sacrament*, which I am to give to the person of *Christ* as *God* and *man*; and that the *body* of *Christ* being present in the *Sacrament*, I may on the account of that presence give the same honour to the *Sacrament*, in which he is present. But if it prove uncertain, whether the *humane nature* of *Christ* as conjoynd to the *divine nature* be capable of receiving proper divine worship, then it must be much more so, whether the *body* of *Christ* as present in the *Sacrament* be so? But granting that, it may be yet uncertain, whether I ought to give the same honour to the *visible part* of the *Sacrament*, which I do to the *humanity* of *Christ*; for though *Christ* may be present there, his presence doth not make the things wherein he is present, capable of the same divine honour with himself. Now that these things are uncertain upon their own principles, I now make appear. I find it generally agreed by the *Doctors* of the *Roman Church*, that the *humane nature* of *Christ*, considered alone, ought not to have *divine honour* given to it; and I find it hotly disputed among them, whether *Christs humane nature* though united to the *divine*, ought, abstractly considered, to have any true *divine honour* given it; and those who deny it, make use of this substantial Argument, proper *divine honour* is due only to *God*, but the *humane nature* of *Christ* is not *God*; and therefore that honour ought not to be given it. And I am further told by them, that the *Church* hath never determined this Controversie. Let me now apply this to our present case: It is certain if the

the *body* of *Christ* be present in the *Eucharist*, as distinct from the *divine nature* I am not to adore it: It is very *uncertain*, if it be present, whether I am to give *divine worship* to the *body of Christ*; but it is most certain, that if I worship *Christ* in the *Sacrament*, it is upon the account of his *corporal presence*. For although when I worship the *person of Christ* as out of the *Sacrament*, my worship is terminated upon him as *God and man*, and the *reason* of my worship is wholly drawn from his *divine nature*; yet when I worship *Christ*, as in the *Sacrament*, I must worship him there upon the account of his *bodily presence*, for I have no other reason to Worship him in the *Sacrament*, but because his *body* is present in it. And this is not barely determining the *place of Worship*, but assigning the *cause* of it, for the primary reason of all *adoration* in the *Sacrament* is, because *Christ* hath said, *This is my body*, which words, if they should be allowed to imply *Transubstantiation*, cannot be understood of any other change than of the *bread* into the *body of Christ*. And if such a sense were to be put upon it, why may not I imagine much more agreeably to the nature of the institution, that the *meer humane nature* of *Christ* is there, than that his *Divinity* should be there in a particular manner present to no end; and where it makes not the least manifestation of it self.

But if I should yield all that can be begged in this kind, *viz.* that the *body of Christ* being present, his *Divinity* is there present too; yet my mind must unavoidably rest unsatisfied still,

as

as to the *adoration* of the *Host*. For the supposing the *divine nature* present in any thing gives no ground upon that account, to give the same *Worship* to the thing wherein he is present, as I do to *Christ* himself. This the more considerative men of the *Roman Church* are aware of, but the different ways they have taken to answer it, rather encrease mens doubts than satisfy them. *Greg. de Valentia* denies not, that "divine honor is given by them to the *Eucharist*:" "and that the accidents remaining after Consecration are the term of adoration, not for themselves, but by reason of the admirable conjunction which they have with *Christ*. Which is the very same which they say of the humane nature of *Christ*, and yet this same person denies, that they are *hypostatically* united to him: which if any one can understand, I shall not envy him. *Bellarmin* in answer to this Argument, is forced to grant as great an *hypostatical union* between *Christ* and the *Sacrament*, as between the *divine* and *humane nature*; for when he speaks of that, he saith it lies in this, that the humane nature loseth its own proper subsistence, and is assumed into the subsistence of the *divine nature*, and in the case of the *Sacrament*, he yields such a losing the proper subsistence of the bread, and that what ever remains makes no distinct suppositum from the body of *Christ*, but all belong to him and make one with him, and therefore may be worshipped as he is. Is not this an admirable way of easing the minds of dissatisfied persons about giving adoration to the *Host*, to fill them with such unintelligible

terms

*Greg. de*  
*Val. de Idol.*  
*lib. l. 2. c. 5.*

*Bel. de*  
*Sac. Euchar.*  
*lib. l. 4. c. 30.*

*D. Jacar.*  
*nat. l. 3. c. 8.*

terms and notions ; which it is impossible for them to understand themselves, or explain to others ? *Vasquez* therefore finding well that the force of the Argument lay in the presence of *Christ*, and that from thence they must at last derive only, the ground of adoration ; very ingenuously yields the Consequence, and grants that God may very lawfully be adored by us in any created Being, wherein he is intimately present : and this he not only grants ; but contends for in a set *disputation*, wherein he proves very well from the principles of *Worship* allowed in the *Roman Church*, that God may be adored in inanimate and irrational Beings as well as in *Images* ; and answers all the Arguments the very same way that they defend the other, and that we may worship the *Sun* as lawfully, and with the same kind of *Worship* that they do an *Image*, and that men may be worshipped with the same *Worship* with which we *Worship God* himself, if our mind do not rest in the Creature, but be terminated upon *God*, as in the adoration of the *Host*. See here the admirable effects of the doctrine of *divine worship* allowed and required in the *Roman Church* ! For, upon the very same principles that a *Papist* *Worships Images, Saints, and the Host*, he may as lawfully *Worship the Earth, the Stars, or Men* ; and be no more guilty of *Idolatry* in one, than in the other of them. So that if we have no more reason to *Worship the person of Christ*, than they have to adore the *Host* ; upon their principles we have no more ground to worship *Christ*, than we have to worship any creature in the world.

*Vasquez*  
Tom. 1.  
disp. 108.  
c. 12, 111.

Disp. 110.  
c. 2, 3.

No such  
motives to  
believe  
Transub-  
stantiation  
as the Di-  
vinity of  
Christ.

§. 5. 2. There are not the same motives and grounds to believe the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, that there are to believe that *Christ* is *God*, which he affirms, but without any appearance of reason. And I would gladly know, what excellent motives and reasons those are, which so advantageously recommend so absurd a doctrine as *Transubstantiation* is, as to make any man think he hath reason to believe it? I am sure it gives the greatest advantage to the enemies of *Christs* divinity, to see these two put together upon equal terms: as though no man could have reason to believe *Christ* to be the *Eternal Son of God*, that did not at the same time swallow the greatest contradictions to sense and reason imaginable. But what doth he mean by *these motives and grounds to believe*? The authority of the *Roman Church*? I utterly deny that to be any ground of believing at all, and desire with all my heart to see it proved: but this is a proper means to believe *Transubstantiation* by, for the ground of believing is as absurd as the doctrine to be believed by it. If he means *Catholick Tradition*, let him prove, if he can, that *Transubstantiation* was a Doctrine received in the *universal Church*, from our *Saviours* time; and when he pleases I shall joyn issue with him upon that subject. And if he thinks fit to put the negative upon me, I will undertake to instance in an *Age* since the three first Centuries, wherein if the most Learned Fathers and *Bishops* (yea of *Rome* it self) be to be credited, *Transubstantiation* was not believed. But if at last he means

means *Scripture* ( which we acknowledge for our only rule of faith, and shall do in spite of all pretences to *Infallibility* either in *Church* or *Tradition* ) I shall appeal even to *Bellarmin* himself in this case, whether there are the same motives and grounds from thence to believe *Transubstantiation*, as, there are, the *Divinity of Christ*. In the proof of *Transubstantiation*, his only Argument is from those words, *this is my body*, Which words, saith he, do necessarily infer *Bellar. de*  
either a real mutation of the Bread as the *Catholicks* hold, or a metaphorical as the *Calvenist*, *Sacr. Euch.*  
*but by no means do admit the Lutherans sense*; *l. 3. c. 19.*  
and so spends the rest of the Chapter against them : and concludes it thus, *Although there be some obscurity or ambiguity in the words of our Lord, yet that is taken away by Councils and Fathers*, and so passes to them. Which are a plain indication, he thought the same which others of his Religion have said, *That the doctrine of Transubstantiation could not be proved from Scripture alone*. But when he proves *De Christo.*  
the *Divinity of Christ*, he goes through nine several classes of Arguments, six of which are wholly out of *Scripture*; the first out of both Testaments, the second only out of the *Old*, the third out of the *New*, the fourth from the names of the true *God* given to *Christ*, the fifth from the Divine Attributes, *Eternity*, *Immensity*, *Power*, *Wisdom*, *Goodness*, *Majesty*; the sixth from the proper works of *God*, *Creation*, *Conservation*, *Salvation*, *Foreknowing of secret things*, and working *Miracles*. All which he largely insists upon, with  
great



great strength and clearness ; so that if he may be judge, the motives to believe the *Divinity* of *Christ*, are far from being the same in *Scripture* that there are to believe *Transubstantiation*.

A mistake  
doth not  
excuse from  
Idolatry.

§. 6. 3. But supposing they are mistaken in the belief of this doctrine, this doth not excuse them from *Idolatry*. To this quotation out of *Dr. Taylors Liberty of prophesying* to the contrary, I shall return him the opinion of their own *Divines*. The Testimony of *Coster* is sufficiently known to this purpose, who saith the same thing in effect that I had done, *If the doctrine of Transubstantiation be not true, the Idolatry of the Heathens in worshipping some Golden or Silver Statue, or any Images of their Gods, or the Laplanders Worshipping a red cloth, or the Egyptians an animal, is more excusable, than of Christians that Worship a bit of bread.* And our Countryman *Bishop Filher* confesseth, *That if there be nothing but bread in the Eucharist, they are all Idolaters.* But none is so fit to answer *Dr. Taylor* as himself, after almost twenty years time to consider more thoroughly of those things, and then he confesseth, *That the Weapons he useth for their defence were but wooden daggers, though the best he could meet with ; and if that be the best they have to say for themselves which he hath produced for them, their probabilities will be soon out-balanced by one Scripture-testimony urg'd by Protestants ; and thou shalt not worship any graven Images, will outweigh all the best and fairest imaginations of their Church : and elsewhere, That the second Commandment is so plain, so easie, so peremptory against*

*Coster En-*  
*chir. Contr.*  
*c. 8. de*  
*Euch. Sa-*  
*cram. p. 308.*

*Fisher c.*  
*Oecolum-*  
*pad. l. 1.*  
*c. 2. p. (cp.)*  
*760.*

*B. Taylors*  
second part  
of dissiwa-  
tive Intro-  
duct: in  
Answ. to  
*I. S. 5. ways.*

all the making and Worshipping any Image or likeness of any thing, that besides that every man naturally would understand all such to be forbidden, it is so expressed, that upon supposition that God intend to forbid it wholly, it could not more plainly have been expressed. By which it is clear he did not think that Idolatry did lie only in forsaking the true God, and giving divine Worship to a Creature or an Idol, that is to an imaginary God, who hath no foundation in essence or existence; which is the reason he brings why they are excused from Idolatry in Adoration of the Host, because the object of their adoration is the true God; for he not only makes the second Command to be peremptory and positive against the Worship of the true God, by an Image, but elsewhere plainly determines this to be Idolatry, and saith, that an Image then becomes an Idol, when divine Worship is given to it; and that, to Worship false Gods, or to give divine honor to an Image which is not God, is all one kind of formal Idolatry. If therefore they cannot be excused from Idolatry, who worship the true God by an Image, though the object of their adoration be right, and they think the manner of it to be lawful; neither can they who worship Christ, upon the account of Transubstantiation in the Sacrament; for not only the superstition of an undue object, but of a prohibited manner or way of Worship is Idolatry; even according to the opinion of him whom he produces as a testimony of their innocence.

2 Part of  
diffusal.  
b. 2. f. 6.  
p. 138.

Doctor dubitant. b. 2.  
c. 2. p. 344.  
p. 339.

The grossest Idolatry excusable on the same grounds.

Aug. prefat. in Psal. 93. Tom. 8. p. 2. p. 184.

Rom. 10.

18

Ang. c. Faust. Manich. l. 20. p. 1. 68.

Joh. 8. 9.

§. 7. 4. That if a mistake in this case will excuse them, it would excuse the grossest Idolatry in the world. St. Austin speaks of some, who said that Christ was the Sun; and therefore worshipped the Sun; I desire to know whether this were Idolatry in them or no? They had Scripture to plead for it as plain as, *This is my body*, for he is not only called the Sun of Righteousness; but the Vulgar Latin (which they contend to be the only Authentick Version) reads that place, *Psal. 19. 6. In sole posuit tabernaculum suum*, He hath placed his Tabernacle in the Sun; and that this is to be understood of Christ, may be proved from the Apostles applying the other words, *their line is gone out through all the earth*, to the Apostles preaching the Gospel. And the Manichees did believe that Christ had his residence partly in the Sun, and partly in the Moon; and therefore they directed their prayers always to the Sun. Let us now consider two persons equally perswaded, that the Sun is now the Tabernacle of Christ, and that he is really present there, and dispenses all the comfortable influences of heat and light to the world, he being so often in Scripture called the true light; and another, that he is really present by Transubstantiation in the Sacrament. I would fain understand why the one should not be as free from Idolatry, as the other? If it be said, that all those places which speak of Christ as the Sun, are to be understood Metaphorically, that is the same thing we say to them concerning those words of Christ, *This is my body*; and if notwithstanding

ing that, they are excused by believing otherwise; so must the other person unavoidably be so too. It is to no purpose to alledge *Fathers* and *Councils*, for one opinion more than for the other; for the question is not concerning the probability of one mistake more than of the other (although if they be strictly examined, the absurdities of *Transubstantiation* are much greater) but we suppose a *mistake* in both, and the question is, whether such a mistake doth excuse from *Idolatry* or no? and we are not to enquire into the reasons of the *mistake*, but the influence it hath upon our actions. And then we are yet to seek why a mistake equally involuntary as to the real object of divine adoration, may not excuse from *Idolatry*, as well as to the wrong application of Worship due to a real object of adoration? *i. e.* Whether a man giving adoration to what he believes to be *God*, which is not so in it self, be not as excusable, as believing a true object of adoration in general, but giving divine worship to that which is not it? as whether the worshipping false Gods, supposing them to be true, be not as venial a fault, as worshipping that for the true *God* which is not so? as for instance, suppose the *Egyptians* worshipping the *Sun* for *God*, and the *Israelites* the golden *Calf*, believing it was the true *God* which brought them out of the *Land* of *Egypt*? or let us take one of the *Inca's* of *Peru*, who believed by a Tradition supposed infallible among them, that the *Sun* was their *Father* and the *visible God*, by which the *Invisible* did govern the *World*;

Garcilasso  
de la vega  
le Commen-  
taire Royal.  
liv. 2. c. 1.

and therefore they ought to give all external adoration to the Sun, and internal only to the *Invisible Deity*; upon what account shall these be charged with Idolatry, if an involuntary mistake, and firm belief that they worship the true God, doth excuse from it? Nay the most stupid and senseless of all *Idolaters* who worshipped the very *Images* for *Gods* (which the wisest among them always disclaimed, and pretended only such a relative worship as he pleads for) were in truth the most excusable upon this ground; for supposing that it be true which they believed, they did a very good thing, and what every person else ought to do upon the same belief. Which is the utmost can be said for the *Papists* adoration of the *Host*, supposing the doctrine of *Transubstantiation* were as true as it is false and absurd.

Of Invocation of Saints.

§. 8. 3. As to *Invocations of Saints*, I found the chief answer given was this, *That they did not attribute the same kind of excellency to Saints, which they give to God; but suppose only a middle sort of excellency between God and us, which they make the foundation of the worship which is given to them.* And as to this my Argument was thus framed, If the supposition of a middle excellency between God and us, be sufficient ground for formal Invocation, then the Heathens worship of their inferior *Deities* could be no *Idolatry*, for they still pretended, they did not give to them the worship proper to the Supreme God; which is as much as is pretended by the devoutest *Papists* in justification

fication of the *Invocation of Saints*. To this he answers two ways: 1. By shewing the disparity of the Heathens worship from theirs in two things: 1. In the object. 2. In the manner of their worship. 1. The persons whom they worship, he saith, are such as are endowed with supernatural gifts of grace in this life, and glory in Heaven; whose prayers by consequence are acceptable and available with God, but the Supreme Deity of the Heathens, is known to be Jupiter, and their inferior Deities Venus, Mars, Bacchus, Vulcan, and the like rabble of Devils as the Scripture calls them; and therefore there can be no consequence, that because the Heathens were Idolaters in the worship of these, though they pretended not to give them the worship proper to Jupiter the Supreme God, therefore the Catholicks must be guilty of Idolatry in desiring the servants of the true God to pray for them to him. 2. As to the manner of worship, he saith, If any of them did attain, as the Platonists, to the knowledge of the true God, yet as S. Paul says, they did not glorifie him as God, but changed his glory into an Image made like to corruptible man, adoring, and offering sacrifice due to God alone, to the Statues themselves, or the inferior Deities they supposed to dwell or assist in them; which S. Austin upon the 90. Psalm proves to be Devils, or evil Angels; because they required sacrifice to be offered to them, and would be worshipped as Gods. But all he means by formal Invocation, he saith is, desiring or praying the Saints to pray for them. And if this were Idolatry, we must not desire the prayers of a just man, even in this life; because this formal in-



vocation will be to make him an *Inferior Deity*.  
 2. He answers, that the same calumny was cast upon the Catholics in *S. Austins* time, and is answered by him, and his answer will serve as well now as then, in his twentieth Book against *Fauftus*, Chap. 21. who himself held formal Invocation a part of the worship due to Saints, as it is evident from the prayer he made to *S. Cyprian* after his Martyrdom, l. 7. de Bapt. c. Donat. c. 1. and Calvin confesseth (he saith) it was the custom at that time to say, *Holy Mary, or Holy Peter pray for us*. This is his full answer: in which are two things to be examined.  
 1. Whether the disparity between the *Heathen Worship* and theirs be so great, as to excuse them from Idolatry? 2. Whether the answer given by *S. Austin* doth vindicate them: and whether Invocation of Saints, as it is now practised in the Church of Rome, were allowed, or in use then?

The Fathers arguments against Heathen Idolatry condemn Invocation of Saints.

§. 9. 1. Concerning the disparity. 1. As to the object of worship. Far be it from me to parallel the *Holy Angels* and *Saints*, with the impure *Deities* of the *Heathens*, as to their excellencies: but the true state of the Question is, Whether the *Heathens* were only too blame in making an ill choice of those they worshipped, as in worshipping *Jupiter*, and *Venus*, and *Vulcan*, who are supposed to have been wicked wretches, or else in giving divine worship to any besides the true God? And if their Idolatry lay not only in the former, but the latter, then this disparity cannot excuse them. There were two Questions in debate between the Pri-

Primitive Fathers of the Christian Church, and the Heathen Idolaters. The first was more general, and in *Thesi*; Whether it were lawful to give divine worship to any besides the true and Supream God? The second was more particular, and in *Hypothesi*; Whether on supposition that were lawful, those whom the Heathens worshipped were fit objects for such adoration? In this latter they triumph over them with a great deal of eloquence, laying open the impiety of those whom they commonly worshipped; but withal, knowing that the wiser among them had another notion of these *Deities* under the common names than the *Vulgar* had, they therefore charge them with *Idolatry*, in giving the worship proper to God, to any Creature, let it be never so excellent, and serviceable to mankind: and tell us, that it was the property of the Christian Religion to give divine worship to none, but God himself; and his Son Christ Jesus; without ever making any any distinctions of absolute and relative worship, which they must have been driven to, in case they had given Religious worship to any besides. Thus *Justin Martyr* tells the Heathen Emperours, to whom he makes his *Apology* for the Christians, that Christ did persuade men to worship God alone, by saying, This is the great Commandment, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve; and that we are to render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsars, and to God the things that are Gods: on which account, saith he, we worship God alone, and give cheerful service in all other things to you. *Theophilus Bishop of Antioch* (who lived

*Justin Martyr*  
*Apol. 2.*  
*p. 65. 66.*

*Theophil ad*  
*Authe. l. 1.*  
*2. 77.*

L. 2. p. 110.

in the second Century after Christ, as well as *Justin* ) giving an account why the *Christians* refused to give adoration to the *Emperors*, as was then used ( not that adoration, which was proper to the *Supreme God*; for none can be so senseless to imagine, they required that: but such kind of Religious worship, as they gave to the *Images* of their *Gods* ) saith, *That as the King or Emperor suffers none under him to be called by his name; and that it is not lawful to give it to any but himself: so neither is it to worship any, but God alone: and elsewhere saith, that the Divine Law doth not only forbid the worship of Idols, but of the Elements, the Sun, and Moon, and Stars, or any thing else in Heaven, in Earth, in Sea, or Fountains, or Rivers; but we ought only to worship the true God and Maker of all things, in the holiness of our hearts, and integrity of our minds.* To the same purpose spake *Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertulian, Cyprian, Origen, Athanasioras, Lactantius, Arnobius*; who all agree, that Religious worship is proper to the true God, and that no created thing is capable of it, on that very account because it is created; it were easie to produce their testimonies, if it were requisite in so evident a matter as this is. If it be said, *That all these testimonies are only against that Idolatry which was then practised by the Heathens.* I answer, 1. Their reasons equally extend to the giving Divine worship to any *Created Being* whatsoever; so that either they argued weakly and unskillfully, or else it is as unlawful to give *Divine worship* now to *Saints*, as it was then to any creature.

2. I would willingly understand, why it should be more unlawful to worship *God* for his admirable Wisdom, and Power and Goodness in the works of Creation, than in supposed *Saints*? i. e. why, I may not as well honour *God* by giving worship to the *Sun*, as to *Ignatius Loyola*, or *St. Francis*, or any other late *Canonized Saint*? I am sure the *Sun* is a certain monument of Gods Goodness, Wisdom, and Power, and I cannot be mistaken therein, but I can never be certain of the *Holiness* of those persons I am to give divine worship to. For all that I can know, *Ignatius Loyola* was a great hypocrite; but I am sure that the *Sun* is none; but that he shines, and communicates perpetual influences to the huge advantage of the world. However I know the best of men have their corruptions, and to what degree it is impossible for others to understand; but I am certain the spots in the *Sun* are no Moral impurities, nor displeasing to God. And *Philip Neri* could not have been mistaken in the shining of the *Sun*, although he might be in the shining of *Ignatius* his face; which yet is thought so considerable a thing, that it is read in the Lessons appointed for *Ignatius* in the *Roman Breviary*.

*Breviary.*  
*Rom. 31.*  
*Jnl. Antw.*  
1663.

3. On what account should the *Christians* refuse giving all external signs of Religious worship to the *Heathen Emperours*, if they thought it lawful to be given to any sort of men? Why might not they worship the *Statues* of *Kings* and *Princes*, as well as others do those of *Rebels* and *Traytors*? I mean, why might not the *Image* of *King Henry the second* have the

the same reverence shewn to it, that the *Shrine* of *Thomas Becket* had? unless it be more meritorious to disobey a *Prince*, than to give him reverence. Might not the *Primitive Christians* have much easier defended themselves, in giving those outward signs of worship to the *Images* of *Emperours*, than others can do in the worship they give to *Saints*? For they might have pleaded, that external signs are to be interpreted by the intention of the person who uses them; that they intended no more by them, but the highest degree of Civil honour on the account of the authority they possessed? or if this would not serve, might not they have said, that *Kings* and *Princes* were *Gods Vicgerents*, and represented him to the world, and that in giving divine worship to them, they gave it to *God*, and that their absolute, ultimate, and terminative worship was upon *God*; and only a relative, inferior, and tranlient worship was given to them; and all this might be better justified by *St. Basils* rule, *That the honour of the Image passes to the Pototype*; for he there pleads for the worship of *Christ*, because he is one with the *Father*, being his *Image*; as the *Image* of a *King* is called the *King*, and hath the same honour given to it; for the honour of the *Image* passeth to the thing represented. And as *Christ* hath the advantage above all, by being *Gods natural Image*; so *Princes* above *Saints*, in that they represent *God* to the world, which the other do not. But notwithstanding all these Pleas, the *Primitive Christians* were so punctual in obvierving that Command of worshipping

*S. Basil. ad  
Anphiloch.  
p. 332.*

shipping God alone, that they rather chose to lose their lives and suffer Martyrdom, than be in the least guilty of giving any divine worship to a creature.

4. They absolutely deny, that any religious worship is to be given to the most excellent created Beings; and therefore did not only condemn the Idolatry then in use, but that which hath obtained in the *Roman Church*: supposing all the persons worshipped therein to have been real *Saints*. For that, we are to consider that all the *Heathens* were not such great Fools, as some men make them, to excuse themselves: if the wiser men were contented to let the people worship the *Poetical Gods*, having their minds possessed with those *Idea's* of them, which they had taken up by their education; yet they understood them only as *Allegories*, (as some make the Image of St. *Christopher*, and St. *George* in the *Church of Rome* to be no other) and they had Temples erected to the greatest Vertues, to *Piety*, *Faith*, *Concord*, *Justice*, *Chastity*, *Clemency*, &c. and others to the greatest Benefactors to mankind; which was the only ground they pleaded, for giving worship to them: but still they acknowledge one *Supream God*, not *Jupiter of Crete*, but the *Father of Gods and men*; only they said, this *Supream God* being of so high a nature, and there being other intermediate beings between him and men, whose Office they conceived it was to carry the prayers of men to God, and to bring down help from him to them; they thought it very fitting, to address their solemn supplications

V. Aug. 6.  
Faust. l. 10.  
c. 9.

Baron.  
Martyrol.  
Apr. 23. &  
Julii 25.



to them. Here now was the very same case in debate, (altering only the names of things) which is between us, and the Church of Rome; and if ever they speak home to our case, they must upon this point. And so they do, but very little to their comfort.

All divine  
worship  
given to a  
creature  
condemned  
by the Fa-  
thers.

Origen. c.  
Cels. l. 8.  
p. 381.

§. 10. These things I shall largely prove, if farther occasion be given; at present I shall only insist on two things. 1. That they did condemn all such kind of worship, supposing their principle true. 2. That they did not only condemn it, in those Spirits which the *Heathens* worshipped, but in good *Angels* themselves. 1. They did condemn the worship, supposing their principle true. For this I shall produce now but few Authorities, but such as are full as to the *Heathens* pretences, and the *Christians* answers. The first is of *Origen* in his answer to *Celsus*, who objects against the *Christians*, the unreasonableness of forsaking the worship of inferiour Deities, because no man can serve two Masters; which, saith he, is a seditious principle, and arises from attributing our passions to God; but he that honours them as Subjects to the Supreme God, cannot offend him who is the Lord of them. To which *Origen* answers, That the Scripture doth indeed stile God, the God of Gods; and Lord of Lords, but withal saith, that to us, there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him; which the Apostle speaks, saith he, of himself and all others, whose minds were raised up to him who is the God of Gods, and Lord of Lords, and his mind ascends up to the Supreme God,

\* who

who worships him inseparably and indivisibly by his Son, who alone conducts us to the Father. Therefore seeing there are many Gods and many Lords, we endeavour by all means; not only to carry our minds above those things on Earth, which are worshipped by the Heathen for Gods, but above those whom the Scripture calls Gods, by which it is plain by the drift of his discourse, he means the Angels. And Celsus afterwards yielding, That it is not lawful to give honour to any, but to whom the Supreme doth communicate it: Origen desires proof from them, That God hath communicated this honour to their Gods, Heroes and Demons; and that it did not arise from the ignorance and folly of mankind, who thereby fell off from him who ought properly to be worshipped. But he proves, from Miracles, and Prophecies, and Precepts, that this honour was given to Christ, that they who honour the Father, should honour the Son also: and that was all which Celsus had to object against the Christians, That they did not keep to their own rule, of worshipping God alone; for they thought God was not dishonoured, by the honour they gave to Christ; and on the same account he thought, they might give it to inferiour Deities. If there had been then any suspicion of Religious worship given to Saints or Angels by the Christians, when had there been a more proper season to object it? No man, of the meanest capacity, would have omitted a matter so necessary to his business; much less so inquisitive and malicious an enemy, as Celsus was. And the account Origen gives of the worship the Christians attribute to the Son of God is, because it is said, I and my Father are one; and the Father in me, and I in

P. 384

in him; which cannot be said of any created Beings. It is true, afterwards he saith, *That if Celsus had spoken of the true Ministers of God, such as Gabriel, Michael and all the Angels and Archangels, he acknowledges, that by explaining the notion of worship or respect, and the actions of those who give it, somewhat more might be said on that subject.* But he utterly denies, that our prayers are to be offered to any, but Christ alone; and that any word which is proper only to Religious worship, is to be attributed to the Angels themselves. For he saith elsewhere, *Although the*

L. 5. p. 233. *Angels be called Gods in Scripture, yet we are not to worship them with divine worship: and lest any should think, that offering up our Prayers or Invocations to them were not excluded by this; he immediately explains himself; For, saith he, all our supplications, prayers, intercessions and thanksgivings are to be offered only to God over all; by that High Priest who is greater than all the Angels, the living Word, and God. And afterwards saith,* κείνοισιν μὴ δῶν ἐνχεσθαι τοῖς ἐυχουμένοις

P. 238. *we ought not to pray to them, who pray for us; for they would rather themselves send us to that God to whom they pray, than have us pray to them, or divide our supplications between God and them. This he speaks indeed of the Sun, and Moon, and Stars, but upon the supposition that they are intellectual Beings, and do pray to God for us.*

L. 8. p. 395. *And again he saith, We ought to pray only to the God over all, and his only Son the first born of every creature, who as our High Priest, offers our prayers to his God and our God. And because Celsus argues much for worship to be given to*

*Demons,*

*Demons, because to them is committed the care of terrestrial affairs: to this Origen answers, by denying those whom he calls Demons, to have any administration of the affairs of Christians; but supposing we knew they were not Demons, but Angels, which had the management of these things committed to them, yet then we dare not give them that honour which is due to God, for neither would God have it so, nor they themselves; but ἐκκλησιῶν δούλοις καὶ μακαρίσιν, we celebrate their praise and happiness, to whom God hath entrusted such great things. But Celsus yet further urges, that, according to the doctrine of the Egyptians, every part of a man hath a particular Demon, or Etherial God; and every one of these being invocated, heals the diseases of the parts proper to themselves. Why then may they not justly invoke them, if they love health better than sickness, and happiness than misery. If one of the Church of Rome had been to answer Celsus, he must have told him, that the thing was rational which he said, only they were out in their names; for instead of Chnumen, Chnaachumen, Cnat, Sicat, Bin, Eru, &c. they should have chosen Raphael for travelling, and against Diseases, Apollonia against the Tooch-ach, Sebastian and Roch against the Plague, St. Nicholas against Tempests, Michael and St. George against Enemies; and others in like cases. For so Serrarius tells us, That experience and tradition hath discovered the particular help of these in such cases; if they be particularly invocated. But Origen gives a shorter answer, That these things do arise from a distrust of the sufficiency of that incommunicable worship,*

Serrar. Lib.  
2. q. 32.

worship we give to God alone, as though he were not able to protect every one that serves him from all snares: and that far more effectual cures have been wrought by the name of Jesus than all their Demons. And how much better do those who are Christians, who slight all these things and commit themselves to God over all, through his son Jesus Christ; and of him do desire the help and protection of his Holy Angels? I shall conclude his Testimony with that excellent saying of his. Our care ought to be to please one God over all, and to make him propitious to us, by piety and all virtue, but if we would have others under God to be pleased with us too, we ought to consider, that as the shadow follows the body, so God being pleased, all his friends whether Angels, souls or Spirits will be so too, and not only so, but are ready to help them, and pray to God for them. But not the least foundation in his discourse for our invocation of them.

P. 430.

Ambros in  
1 Rom. To.  
5. p. 174.

The Author of the Commentaries under the name of St. Ambrose, of the same age with him (as appears by several passages in him) saith, That the Idolaters made use of this miserable excuse for themselves, that by those inferiour Deities they worshipped, they went to God himself; as we go to the King by his Courtiers. But, saith he, is any man so mad, or regardless of himself, to give the honour due to the King to any of his Courtiers; which if a man does, he is condemned for treason? And yet they think themselves not guilty, who give the honour due to Gods name, to a creature; and forsaking God adore his fellow servants, as though any thing greater than that were

were reserved for God himself. But therefore we go to a King by his Officers and Servants, because the King is but a man, who knows not of himself whom to employ in his publick affairs, (without being recommended by others :) But with God it is otherwise, for nothing is hid from him, he knows the deserts of every one, and therefore we need no one to recommend us to his Favour; a devout mind is enough. Was this now all the quarrel the Christians had with the Heathens, that they worshipped Jupiter and Venus and Vulcan? Do they not expressly deny the giving Gods Worship to any Creature? and do they not as plainly affirm, that men do it when they invoke their fellow servants to be intercessors with God for them? and that it is no less a guilt of Idolatry in this case, than it is in giving the Honour due to a Prince to any of his Servants?

St. Austin gives this account of the principles of the Heathen Worship, that there were three sorts of Beings to be considered, purely divine, and mortal, and a middle sort between them, which participated of both; and that the intercourse between Gods and men, was by the means of those intermediate Beings, who carried the prayers of men up to God, and brought down the blessings they prayed for to men. Against these indeed St. Austin disputes first, by shewing that those spirits which they worshipped were evil spirits; and that there was no reason to imagine, that God had a greater intercourse with them, than with penitent sinners, but withal he adds, that this kind of worship doth proceed upon the

Aug. de  
Civ. Dei.  
l. 8. c. 14,  
18.

C. 21.



*Supposition that the Gods cannot know the necessities and prayers of men, but by the intervention of those Spirits: but if our minds can be known without their help, there is no need of their mediation.* And afterwards saith, that those who are Christians do believe, that we need not many, but one Mediatour; and that such a one, by whose participation we are made happy, i. e. the word of God, not made, but by whom all things were made: and He hath shewed, that to the attaining blessedness we ought not to seek many Mediators, by whom we are to make our degrees of approach to God; because God himself, by partaking our Nature, hath shewn us the shortest way of our partaking his divinity. Neither doth He, delivering us from mortality and misery, carry us so to immortal and blessed Angels, that by participating with them, we should become blessed and immortal; but to that Trinity, by whose participation the Angels themselves are blessed. And concludes that Book with this saying, that immortal and blessed Spirits, howe'er they are called, which are made and created, are no Mediators to bring miserable mortals to blessedness and immortality. And it would be ridiculous here to distinguish, mediators of redemption and intercession; for all that they attributed to their good spirits was only Intercession; and Christ being made a Mediator, effectual for the end he designed, there could be no necessity of any Intercessors besides him. And St. Austin there adds, that the design of his following Book is to prove; that those good Spirits which are immortal and blessed, which they thought ought to be Wor-

shipped

shipped with Sacred Rites and Sacrifices, whatsoever they are and howsoever called, would not have any one worshipped by such religious worship, (i. e. by sacred rites as well as Sacrifices) but only one God, by whom they were created, and by whose participation they are made happy.

§. 11. By which the second thing I proposed will appear to be true, viz. that they did not only condemn giving this Worship to the Spirits which the Heathen worshipped, but to good Angels too. For St. Paul in the general doth condemn the Worship of Angels; if he had meant only evil Angels he would have expressed it so; especially if St. Austins observation be true, that the evil Spirits are by their names in Scripture distinguished from the good; if he had meant any particular superstition, used in the Worship of Angels, he would not have used such terms which condemn all worship of them as superstitious; if he had meant only the Worship of Angels, so as to exclude Christ, he would have intimated that the fault, lay in excluding Christ, and not in the bare worship of Angels; but by the series of his discourse it appears, that those who set up other Mediators besides Christ do not hold the head, i. e. do not adhere to Christ alone, as him whom God hath appointed as our Mediatour only. Whether this were practised by Jewes, Philosophers, or Hereticks is all one to us; since the practice is condemned, wherever it is found. Theodoret saith, they were the Jewes who per-

The Wor-  
ship of  
Angels  
condemn-  
ed.  
Col. 2. 18.

Theod. in  
Coloss 2 18

swaded men to worship Angels, because the Law was delivered by Angels; which practice

he saith, continued a long time in Phrygia and Pisidia, and therefore the Synod of Laodicea doth forbid praying to Angels; and to this day, the Oratories of St. Michael are among them; they therefore thought it a piece of humility, since God could not be seen, nor touched, nor comprehended by us, to obtain the favour of God, by the intercession of Angels. No wonder Baronius is so much displeased with Theodoret for this interpretation; for he very fairly tells us what he condemns (and St. Paul too) was the practice of their Church; and those Oratories were set up by Catholicks, and not by hereticks. But whether as to the lawfulness of this Worship, Baronius or St. Paul, whether as to the ancient practice of the Church, Baronius or Theodoret deserves more to be believed, I leave any one to judge. And yet Theodoret is not alone in this; for

Irenæus denies any invocations of Angels to be in use among Christians; if he had meant only evil Angels, it seems very strange he should use the name generally given to good, and always indifferent to both. Origen expressly denies any offering up of Prayers to them, to be practised by Christians, or reasonable to be done; and produces this very place of the Apostle against it. The Council of Laodicea, we see by Theodoret, is very severe against all who worship Angels, and charges them with Idolatry in so doing; if they had only meant the Heathen Idolaters, as Baronius contends, yet by that it appears that the Heathens were condemned for Worshipping those, whom they believed to be good spirits; but these are only shifts, to escape by, and such which

Baron. An.  
60. f. 10, 21.

Iren. l. 2.  
c. 57.

Orig. c. Cel.  
l. 5. p. 233.  
P. 236.

Concil. Lao-  
dic. Can.  
35.

which would not have come into the mind of any man, if he did not first fear the force of that Canon against the practice of the Roman Church. For why the Heathen Idolatry should at that time be called *secret or hidden*, as it is in that Canon, is not easie to be thought upon; but very easily intelligible according to Theodoret's interpretation, because of the clandestine meetings of those who worshipped Angels, and therein separated themselves from the Christian Churches. St. Austin discourses purposely on this subject (as is intimated before) whether God or the Blessed Spirits are willing we should perform any sacred offices or Sacrifices to them; or consecrate our selves, or any thing of ours, to them, by any religious rites: which he denies: For this, saith he, is the worship proper to the Deity, called by him in one word *Latria*, which he thinks more proper to express divine worship, as distinct from the honour and service we give to men (which is plainly his meaning there) than any one word Greek or Latin besides. And this word he saith is proper to the Deity, as such; because he elsewhere tells us, the difference between *λατρία* and *δουλία*, is this, that *λατρία* is the Service of God, properly, as God; *δουλία* is the service of God, as Lord.

Aug. de civ. Dei  
l. 10. c. 1.

Aug. q. in  
Exod. q. 94.

§. 12. I know very well by what arts all these testimonies are endeavoured to be evaded, viz. by saying, That these are intended against the Gentiles Idolatry, who worshipped those Spirits as Gods, and offered Sacrifices to them; but this cannot hold as to the Doctrine or practice of the Roman Church, who deny them to be Gods,

The common evasions answered.

and asserts that the *Worship by Sacrifice* is proper only to God: but such devices as these are can never satisfy an impartial mind. For (1.) They do expressly deny, that *invocation* or *prayer* is to be made to them; for so *Origen* and *Theodore* speaks expressly, that men are not to pray to *Angels*; and any one that reads *St. Austin* will find, that he makes solemn invocation to be as proper to God, as *Sacrifice* is. (2.) On what account should it be unlawful to *Sacrifice* to *Saints* or *Angels* if it be lawful to *invoke* them? may not one be *relative* and *transient* as well as the other? nay the *Heathen* in *St. Austin* argued very well, that *Sacrifices*, being meer external things, might more properly belong to the *Inferiour Deities*; but the more invisible the Deity was, the more invisible the *Sacrifices* were to be; and the greater and better the Deity, the *Sacrifice* was to be still proportionable: and can any man in his senses think, that a meer outward *Sacrifice* is more acceptable to God, than the devotion of our heart is? and wherein can we better express that to God, than in offering up our prayers to him? so that in all reason the duty of prayer ought to be reserved as more proper to God than any external sacrifice; and those who did appropriate *Sacrifice* to God, did comprehend prayer as the most spiritual and acceptable part of it: So *St. Austin* speaking of the *Sacrifice* due to God, makes our heart the *Altar*, and *Christ* our *Priest*, and our *Prayers* and *Praises* to be offered up to God by a fervent charity; and any work, which is therefore done, that thereby we may be united to God in a holy Communion

*Aug. de  
Civ. Dei.  
L. 10. c. 19:*

*L. 10. c. 4.*

munion with him, in order to our happiness, to be *c. 6.*  
 a true Sacrifice; and let any man judge, whether this description do not so naturally agree to prayer, as if it had been only intended for it. Besides, it is observable, that sacrifices of old were solemn rites of supplication; and calling upon the name of the Lord where Altars were erected, is the main thing spoken of; thence the Temple (though the place of sacrifice) is called the house of Prayer; and where God slights sacrifices, he requires prayer as much more acceptable to him. It seems then very strange, that sacrifice alone, as distinguished from prayer, should be that *Latria* that is proper to God. *Ifa. 56. 7.*  
 (3.) Upon the same account that the Heathen did give divine honour to their inferior Deities, those in the Roman Church do so to Angels and Saints. For the Heathens made a difference in their sacrifices to the supreme God, and their inferior Deities and their Heroes: so that if the putting any difference in the way of religious Worship doth excuse the one, it must do the other also. Did the Heathen use solemn Ceremonies of making any capable of divine worship? so does the Roman Church. Did they set up their Images in publick places of worship, and there kneel before them, and invoke those represented by them? so does the Roman Church. Did they consecrate Temples, and erect Altars to them, and keep Festivals, and burn Incense before them? so does the Roman Church. Lastly, did they offer up Sacrifices in those Temples, to the Honour of their lesser Deities and Heroes? so does the Roman Church. *Psal. 50. 6. 15.*



*Bell. de  
Sanct. beat.  
l. 1. c. 7.*

For *Bellarmin*, reckoning up the honours belonging to *Canonized Saints*, besides those before mentioned reckons up this as one, *that the Sacrifices of the Eucharist, and of lauds and prayers are publickly offered to God for their honour.* I would fain understand, what the sacrificing to one for the honour of another means? To offer Sacrifice to one for another, is an intelligible thing; but to Sacrifice to one for the honour of another is a thing beyond my reach, if that sacrifice does not belong to him for whose honour it is offered; and if the sacrifice do belong to him, I wonder at the scrupulosity of those who dare not say they Sacrifice to him as well. For what is sacrificing to God, but sacrificing to his honour, or doing such an act of Religion with a design to honour God by it: but when men offer a Sacrifice, but not to honour God by it, but the *B. Virgin*, or any *Saints* or *Angels*, how can that Sacrifice belong to any other but those whose honour is designed by it? It being then the opinion and practice of the *Roman Church*, that Sacrifices are to be offered for the honour of *Saints* or *Angels*, it is evident they have reserved no part of divine worship peculiar to God himself, any more than the *Heathen* did. (4.) It makes no material difference, that the *Heathen* called those they worshipped Gods, but they do not so in the *Roman Church*. For *St. Austin* saith, *there was scarce any difference between the Heathen and them about the name, whether Angels might be called Gods or no: for he thinks that they are called so in Scripture, as well as Origen: but the Question*

*Aug. de  
civit. Dei  
l. 9. c. 23.*

was

was about the thing, whether they were to be *Worshipped* as *Gods*, or no, *i. e.* by giving any part of *Religious worship* to them? which they utterly deny. And, were I in the Communion of the *Roman Church*, I should much less scruple to call *Canonized Saints* or *Angels*, by the names of *Gods*, than to give them the *worship* of *Invocation* or the honour of *Sacrifices*: And they who do so, are not only condemned by plain *Scripture*, and *Reason*, but by those of the *Primitive Church* who writ against the *Heathen Idolatry*: which was the thing to be shewed.

§. 13. 2. Another disparity is insisted on by him, which is, as to the *manner of worship*. And as to this, he saith, -all that they understand by *formal Invocation*, is *desiring or praying those just persons, who are in glory in heaven to pray for us; and if the Catholicks be guilty of Idolatry in this, we must not desire the prayers of a just man even in this life, because this formal Invocation will be to make him an inferior Deity*. To shew the palpable weakness of this answer, I shall prove these two things. 1. That those in the *Church of Rome* do allow and practise another kind of *formal Invocation*, from what he asserts. 2. That supposing this were all, it would not excuse them; and that it is of a very different nature, from *desiring the prayers of just men for us in this life*.

1. That they do allow and practise another kind of *formal Invocation* from what he asserts. He might very well say, he did not understand well what I meant by *formal Invocation*, when he

Of the  
practice of  
Invocation  
in the  
Church of  
Rome.

he makes this to be the meaning of it ; for never any person before him imagined that sense of it ; And that term of *formal Invocation* was purposely chosen by me, to distinguish it from the *Rhetorical Apostrophe's* of some of the *Greek Fathers*, the *Poetical Flourishes* of *Damascus*, *Prudentius*, and *Paulinus* ; from *general wishes* that the *Saints* would pray for 'us. Of which are some instances, in good Authors ; from *Assemblies at the Monuments of Martyrs*, which were usual in antient times ; and that which I thought any man would understand by it was that which is constantly practised in the *Roman Church*, viz. in places and times purposely appointed for *Divine and Religious Worship*, with all the same external signs of *devotions* which we use to *God* himself, to offer up our *Prayers to Saints*, or *Angels*, to help us in our necessities, as well as to pray to *God* for us. The former part none can be ignorant of, that have but so much as heard of the devotion of the *Church of Rome* ; all the difficulty lies in that, whether *they pray to them to help their necessities*, as well as to pray for them ? And so many forms of Prayer, allowed and practised in their *Church*, have been so often objected to them, wherein these things are manifest, that I cannot but wonder this should be denied. Do they believe, we never look into their *Breviaries*, *Rosaries*, *Hours*, and other Books of Devotion, wherein, to this day, such Prayers are to be found ? Do they think we never heard of the *Offices* of the *B. Virgin*, or our *Ladies Psalter* ( a Blasphemous Book, never yet

censured) wherein the *Psalms*; in their highest strains of *Prayer to God*, are applied to the *V. Mary*? I have known my self intelligent persons of their *Church*, who commit their souls to the *V. Maries* protection every day, as we do to *Almighty Gods*: and such, who thought they understood the doctrine and practice of their *Church*, as well as others. But *Madam*, these are mysteries not to be known till they have their *Profelytes* safe and fast enough; then, by degrees, they let them know, what is to be done, when they have given away all liberty of judging for themselves. Then, it is no matter what they are commanded or expected to do, they must do as others do, or else their sincerity is questioned, and they are thought *Hereticks* in their hearts, whatever they profess. I shall not insist upon any ancient *Breviaries*, or obsolete *Forms*, or private *Devotions*, which yet they are accountable for, till they do condemn them. I need no more than the present *Roman Breviary* restored according to the *Council of Trent*, and authorized by three several *Popes*. In the *Feast of Assumption* of the *Blessed Virgin*, as though it were not enough in the *Antiphona* to say, *Hail Blessed Virgin, thou alone hast destroyed all Heresies in the world*; but lest this should be interpreted of doing it by her Son, a formal *Invocation* of her follows, *Vouchsafe to let me praise thee O Holy Virgin; and give me strength against thy enemies*. And in the *Hymn* frequently used in her *Office*, and particularly that day, she is not only called the *Gate of Heaven*, but she is intreated to loose the bonds of the guilty, to give light to the blind,

BREV. ROM.  
ANTW.  
1663.  
p. 984.

blind, and to drive away our evils, and to shew  
 her self to be a Mother; or as it is in the *Mass-*  
*book* Printed at Paris, 1634. *Jure Matris im-*  
*para redemptori*, by the Authority of a Mother,  
 command the Redeemer. This is not to pray to  
 her, to pray to God for us; but to pray her  
 to order and command him what he shall do  
 for us: And is not this a notable respect to  
*Jesus Christ* now he is in glory, and hath all  
 power in heaven and in earth committed to  
 him; to subject him to the commands of a  
 woman, though honored to be his Mother. In  
 a word, They pray to her therein for purity of  
 life, and a safe conduct to heaven. But lest the  
 Hymns should be thought only Poetical, in the  
 Feast of *S. Maria ad Nives*, Aug. 5. a formal  
 prayer is made to her, to help the miserable, to  
 strengthen the weak, to comfort those that mourn,  
 and that all who celebrate her holy Festivity may  
 feel her assistance. By which we may under-  
 stand the meaning of that solemn Hymn used  
 in her Office, wherein she is called the Mother of  
 Mercy and Clemency, and is prayed to protect us  
 from our enemies, and to receive us in the hour of  
 death. Is all this only praying to her to pray  
 for us? What could be more said to Almighty  
 God, or his Son *Jesus Christ*? Either there  
 can be no such thing as direct and immediate  
 prayers to any one, or these are such. Nor is  
 this devotion only to the Blessed Virgin, but we  
 shall see it alike in that to Angels and Saints;  
 in the Antiphona upon the apparition of Mi-  
 chael the Archangel May 8. he is prayed to come  
 to the help of the people of God. And in the  
 Feast

P. 111.]

Offic. parv.  
 B. Maria,  
 p. 127.

Ecc. p. 214.

Feast of the Guardian Angels, recommended to all Catholics by Paul the fifth, in the last words of the Breviary, they are prayed to defend them in War, that they may not perish in Gods terrible judgement. In the Hymn to the Holy Apostles they are prayed to command the guilty to be loosed from their guilt, to heal unsound minds, and to encrease their vertues, that when Christ shall come, they may be partakers of eternal glory. These may suffice for a present taste of the sincerity of such persons who say, that in the Church of Rome they do nothing but pray to the Saints to pray for them. And it is a very pitiful shift that Bellarmin is put to, whereby to excuse such prayers as these, That indeed as to the words themselves they do imply more than praying to them to pray for us; but the sense of the words, he saith, is no more. But whence I pray must the people take the sense of such prayers as these are, if not from the signification of the words? If this were all, why in all this time that these prayers have been complained of, hath not their sense been better expressed? Have not their Breviaries been often reviewed, if this had not been their meaning, why have they not been expunged all this while? Suppose then that any persons in the Roman Church (as every one ought to do) take their sense from the words, and do not force it upon them, and they pray according to the form prescribed; do they well or ill in it? If they do ill in it, their Church is guilty of intolerable negligence, in not preventing it, if they do well, then their Church allows of

Commur.  
A. 10. 101.  
p. 2. 9.

Bell. de  
Sanct.  
Requit. l. 1.  
c. 17.



*Bell. de  
Sanct. beat.  
l. 1. c. 7.*

For *Bellarmin*, reckoning up the honours belonging to *Canonized Saints*, besides those before mentioned reckons up this as one, *that the Sacrifices of the Eucharist, and of lauds and prayers are publicly offered to God for their honour.* I would fain understand, what the sacrificing to one for the honour of another means? To offer Sacrifice to one for another, is an intelligible thing; but to Sacrifice to one for the honour of another is a thing beyond my reach, if that sacrifice does not belong to him for whose honour it is offered; and if the sacrifice do belong to him, I wonder at the scrupulosity of those who dare not say they Sacrifice to him as well. For what is sacrificing to God, but sacrificing to his honour, or doing such an act of Religion with a design to honour God by it: but when men offer a Sacrifice, but not to honour God by it, but the *B. Virgin*, or any *Saints* or *Angels*, how can that Sacrifice belong to any other but those whose honour is designed by it? It being then the opinion and practice of the *Roman Church*, that Sacrifices are to be offered for the honour of *Saints* or *Angels*, it is evident they have reserved no part of divine worship peculiar to God himself, any more than the *Heathen* did. (4.) It makes no material difference, that the *Heathen* called those they worshipped Gods, but they do not so in the *Roman Church*. For *St. Austin* saith, *there was scarce any difference between the Heathen and them about the name, whether Angels might be called Gods or no: for he thinks that they are called so in Scripture, as well as Origen: but the Question*

*Aug. de  
civit. Dei  
l. 9. c. 23.*

was

was about the thing, whether they were to be *Worshipped* as *Gods*, or no, *i. e.* by giving any part of *Religious worship* to them? which they utterly deny. And, were I in the *Communion* of the *Roman Church*, I should much less scruple to call *Canonized Saints* or *Angels*, by the names of *Gods*, than to give them the *worship* of *Invocation* or the *honour* of *Sacrifices*: And they who do so, are not only condemned by plain *Scripture*, and *Reason*, but by those of the *Primitive Church* who writ against the *Heathen Idolatry*: which was the thing to be shewed.

§. 13. 2. Another disparity is insisted on by him, which is, as to the *manner of worship*. And as to this, he saith, - all that they understand by *formal Invocation*, is *desiring* or *praying* those *Just persons*, who are in *glory* in *heaven* to *pray* for us; and if the *Catholicks* be guilty of *Idolatry* in this, we must not desire the *prayers* of a *just man* even in *this life*, because this *formal Invocation* will be to make him an *inferior Deity*. To shew the palpable weakness of this answer, I shall prove these two things. 1. That those in the *Church of Rome* do allow and practise another kind of *formal Invocation*, from what he asserts. 2. That supposing this were all, it would not excuse them; and that it is of a very different nature, from *desiring the prayers* of *just men* for us in *this life*.

1. That they do allow and practise another kind of *formal Invocation* from what he asserts. He might very well say, he did not understand well what I meant by *formal Invocation*, when he

Of the  
practice of  
*Invocation*  
in the  
*Church of*  
*Rome*.

he makes this to be the meaning of it ; for never any person before him imagined that sense of it ; And that term of *formal Invocation* was purposely chosen by me, to distinguish it from the *Rhetorical Apostrophe's* of some of the *Greek Fathers*, the *Poetical Flourishes* of *Damascus*, *Prudentius*, and *Paulinus* ; from *general wishes* that the *Saints* would pray for 'us. Of which are some instances, in good Authors ; from *Assemblies at the Monuments of Martyrs*, which were usual in antient times ; and that which I thought any man would understand by it was that which is constantly practised in the *Roman Church*, viz. in places and times purposely appointed for *Divine and Religious Worship*, with all the same external signs of *devotions* which we use to *God* himself, to offer up our *Prayers to Saints*, or *Angels*, to help us in our necessities, as well as to pray to *God* for us. The former part none can be ignorant of, that have but so much as heard of the devotion of the *Church of Rome* ; all the difficulty lies in that, whether *they pray to them to help their necessities*, as well as to pray for them ? And so many forms of Prayer, allowed and practised in their *Church*, have been so often objected to them, wherein these things are manifest, that I cannot but wonder this should be denied. Do they believe, we never look into their *Breviaries*, *Rosaries*, *Hours*, and other Books of Devotion, wherein, to this day, such Prayers are to be found ? Do they think we never heard of the *Offices* of the *B. Virgin*, or our *Ladies Psalter* ( a Blasphemous Book, never yet

censured) wherein the *Psalms*; in their highest  
 strains of *Prayer to God*, are applied to the  
*V. Mary*? I have known my self intelligent per-  
 sons of their *Church*, who commit their souls to  
 the *V. Maries* protection every day, as we do to  
*Almighty Gods*: and such, who thought they un-  
 derstood the doctrine and practice of their  
*Church*, as well as others. But *Madam*, these  
 are mysteries not to be known till they have  
 their *Profelytes* safe and fast enough; then, by  
 degrees, they let them know, what is to be  
 done, when they have given away all liberty  
 of judging for themselves. Then, it is no mat-  
 ter what they are commanded or expected to  
 do, they must do as others do, or else their  
 sincerity is questioned, and they are thought *He-*  
*reticks* in their hearts, whatever they profess.  
 I shall not insist upon any ancient *Breviaries*, or  
 obsolete *Forms*, or private *Devotions*, which  
 yet they are accountable for, till they do con-  
 demn them. I need no more than the present  
*Roman Breviary* restored according to the *Coun-*  
*cil of Trent*, and authorized by three several *Popes*.  
 In the *Feast of Assumption* of the *Blessed Virgin*, as  
 though it were not enough in the *Antiphona* to  
 say, *Hail Blessed Virgin, thou alone hast destroyed all*  
*Heresies in the world*; but lest this should be inter-  
 preted of doing it by her Son, a formal *Invocation*  
 of her follows, *Vouchsafe to let me praise thee O*  
*Holy Virgin*; and give me strength against thy ene-  
 mies. And in the *Hymn* frequently used in her  
*Office*, and particularly that day, she is not only  
 called the *Gate of Heaven*, but she is intreated to  
 loose the bonds of the guilty, to give light to the  
 blind,

*Brev. Rom.*  
*Antw.*  
 1663.  
 p. 984.

blind, and to drive away our evils, and to shew  
 her self to be a Mother; or as it is in the *Mass-*  
*book* Printed at Paris, 1634. *Jure Matris im-*  
*para redemptori*, by the Authority of a Mother,  
 command the Redeemer. This is not to pray to  
 her, to pray to God for us; but to pray her  
 to order and command him what he shall do  
 for us: And is not this a notable respect to  
*Jesus Christ* now he is in glory, and hath all  
 power in heaven and in earth committed to  
 him; to subject him to the commands of a  
 woman, though honored to be his Mother. In  
 a word, They pray to her therein for purity of  
 life, and a safe conduct to heaven. But lest the  
 Hymns should be thought only Poetical, in the  
 Feast of *S. Maria ad Nives*, Aug. 5. a formal  
 prayer is made to her, to help the miserable, to  
 strengthen the weak, to comfort those that mourn,  
 and that all who celebrate her holy Festivity may  
 feel her assistance. By which we may under-  
 stand the meaning of that solemn Hymn used  
 in her Office, wherein she is called the Mother of  
 Mercy and Clemency, and is prayed to protect us  
 from our enemies, and to receive us in the hour of  
 death. Is all this only praying to her to pray  
 for us? What could be more said to Almighty  
 God, or his Son *Jesus Christ*? Either there  
 can be no such thing as direct and immediate  
 prayers to any one, or these are such. Nor is  
 this devotion only to the Blessed Virgin, but we  
 shall see it alike in that to Angels and Saints;  
 in the Antiphona upon the apparition of Mi-  
 chael the Archangel May 8. he is prayed to come  
 to the help of the people of God. And in the  
 Feast

P. 111.]

Offic. parv.  
 B. Mariae,  
 p. 127.

Brev. p. 214.

Feast of the Guardian Angels, recommended to all Catholics by Paul the fifth, in the last words of the Breviary, they are prayed to defend them in War, that they may not perish in Gods terrible judgement. In the Hymn to the Holy Apostles they are prayed to command the guilty to be loosed from their guilt, to heal unsound minds, and to encrease their vertues, that when Christ shall come, they may be partakers of eternal glory. These may suffice for a present taste of the sincerity of such persons who say, that in the Church of Rome they do nothing but pray to the Saints to pray for them. And it is a very pitiful shift that Bellarmin is put to, whereby to excuse such prayers as these, *That indeed as to the words themselves they do imply more than praying to them to pray for us; but the sense of the words, he saith, is no more.* But whence I pray must the people take the sense of such prayers as these are, if not from the signification of the words? If this were all, why in all this time that these prayers have been complained of, hath not their sense been better expressed? Have not their *Breviaries* been often reviewed, if this had not been their meaning, why have they not been expunged all this while? Suppose then that any persons in the *Roman Church* (as every one ought to do) take their sense from the words, and do not force it upon them, and they pray according to the form prescribed; do they well or ill in it? If they do ill in it; their Church is guilty of intolerable negligence, in not preventing it, if they do well, then their Church allows of

Commur.  
Apostol.  
P. 2. 9.

Bell. de  
Sacrif.  
Beatic. l. 1.  
c. 17.



of more than praying to *Angels* and *Saints* to pray for them. *Bellarmins* instances of the *Apostles* in *Scripture* being said to *save men*, do shew what shifts a bad cause will put a man to: For will any man in his wits say, the case is the same in ordinary *speech* and in *prayer*? Is it all one, for a man to say, that his *Staff* helped him in his going, and to fall down upon his knees to pray to his *Staff* to help him? *God* did use the *Apostles* as *Instruments* on earth, to promote the *salvation* of mankind; but may we therefore pray to them now in *Heaven*, to save us? May we not truly say, that the *Sun* enlightens the world, but may we therefore pray to the *Sun* to enlighten us? No, the *Sun* is but *Gods Instrument*, and our addressees must be in prayer to the *Supreme Lord* over all. But to take his own explanation of praying to them for these things: i. e. *praying to them that they would pray to God for them, as we desire one another to pray*: Would not that man be condemned of gross *Idolatry*, or prodigious folly, who instead of desiring his *Friends* to pray to *God* for the pardon of his sins, and the assistance of *Divine Grace*, should fall down on his knees before them and say to them, *I pray you pardon my sins, and assist me with the Grace of God*? What would *S. Paul* have said to such men that should have asked such things of him, who yet saith, *that he was an instrument of saving some*?

§. 14. 2. Supposing this were all that were done and allowed in the *Roman Church*, yet this would not excuse them: for their practice is very different in their *Invocation of Saints*, from *desiring our Brethren on earth to pray for us*. And I cannot but wonder, how any men of common sense can suffer themselves to be imposed upon so easily in this matter. For is there really no difference between *S. Pauls* desiring his Brethren *to pray for him*, as he often did; and a mans falling down upon his knees with all the solemnity of devotion he uses to God himself, to *S. Paul*, to desire him to pray for him, when he was present upon earth, and did certainly know what he desired of him? Suppose in the midst of the solemn devotions of the *Church*, where *S. Peter* or *S. Paul* had been present, the *Litanies* of the *Church* had been then as they are now; and after they had prayed to the persons of the *Holy Trinity*, the people should with the same postures, and expressions of devotion, have immediately turned themselves to the *Apostles*, and cried only, *Peter and Paul pray for us*; do you think, this would have been acceptable to them? No doubt *S. Peter* would have been less pleased with this, than with *Cornelius*, only *falling down before him*; and yet then he bid him *stand up, I my self also am a man*. They who impute this only to his *modesty*, will not allow him to carry this *virtue* to Heaven with him; for they suppose him to be very well pleased with that honor in Heaven, which he refused on earth. And *S. Paul* would have rent his garments and

The difference between praying to Saints in Heaven, and desiring men on Earth to pray for us.

Acts 16.  
25, 26.

Acts 14.

14, 15.

and cryed out, as he did to the men of *Lystra*, *Why do ye these things; we also are men of like passions with you?* They would not receive any honour, that might in the least seem to incroach upon the *divine honour*; and yet they might, upon better grounds, have done it to them on earth, than now in heaven; because they were then sure they heard them, which now they can never be. And would it not be a senseless thing, to desire some excellent person in the *Indies*, when we are at our solemn devotion to pray for us, because it is possible, God may at the same time reveal our minds to him? I would willingly be informed, if we had assurance of the *Sanctity* of a person in this life, as great as they have in the *Church of Rome* of those they invoke; whether there would be any evil at all in publick places of worship, and at the time used for the service of God, to set such a person up in some higher place of the Church, to burn incense before him, to prostrate themselves with hands and eyes lifted up to him; if at last they pretended, that all that time they only *prayed to him, to pray for them?* And certainly a good man is much more the *Image of God*, and deserves more reverence than all the artificial *Images of Saints*, or of *God* himself. If they will condemn this, they may conceive, that supposing *they only prayed to Saints in their devotions to pray for them*, this would not excuse them: For they do it in those places, at such times, and in such a manner as highly incroaches upon the worship and service due to God alone.

St. Austin  
no Friend  
to Invoca-  
tion of  
Saints.

§. 15. 2. I now come to consider, whether the answer given by S. *Austin* will vindicate them; and whether Invocation of Saints, as it is now practised in the *Church of Rome*, were allowed, or in use then? Here he tells us, *That Faustus the Manichean calumniates the Catholics* (the word is S. *Austins* he saith, and we do not quarrel with the word, but that they are not such *Catholics* as S. *Austin* speaks of) *because they honoured the Memories or Shrines of Martyrs, charged them to have turned the Idols into Martyrs, whom they worshipped said he with like vows.* To shew how very far what S. *Austin* saith, is from justifying the present practices of the *Roman Church*, we need no more than barely to represent what S. *Austin* affirms, and what he denies. He affirms, that it was the custome of the *Christians* in his time to have their Religious Assemblies at the *Sepulchres* or *Memories* of the *Martyrs*; where the place it self would raise their affections, and quicken their love towards the *Martyrs* and towards *God*: but he utterly denies, that any *Religious worship* was performed to the *Martyrs*; for neither was any Sacrifice offered up to any of them, nor any other part of *Religious worship*: for thereupon he shews (which is very conveniently left out in the citation) *that not only Sacrifice, was refused by Saints and Angels, but any other Religious honour, which is due to God himself, as the Angel forbad S. John to fall down and worship him.* All the worship therefore, he saith, that they give to Saints is, *That of love and*

Aug. de  
Civit. Dei,  
l. 20. c. 10.

L. 8. c. 27.

society, and of the same kind which we give to holy men in this life, who are ready to suffer for the truth of the Gospel. But that the worship of Invocation is expressly excluded by S. Austin, appears by what himself saith on a like occasion; where he shews the difference between the Gentiles worship and theirs: They (saith he) build Temples, erect Altars, appoint Priests, and offer Sacrifices: but we erect no Temples to Martyrs, as to Gods; but Memories as to dead men, whose Spirits live with God; we raise no Altars on which to sacrifice to Martyrs, but to one God, the God of Martyrs, as well as ours; at which, as men of God who have overcome the world by confessing him, they are named in their place and order, but are not invoked by the Priest who sacrifices. And elsewhere saith, Whatever the Christians do at the memories of the Martyrs, is for ornaments to those memories, not as any sacred Rites or Sacrifices belonging to the dead as Gods: we therefore do not worship our Martyrs with Divine honours, nor with the faults of men, as the Gentiles did their Gods. Which gave occasion to Lud. Vives in his Notes on that Chapter to say, that many Christians in his time (what sort of Catholicks those were, it is easie to guess, but to be sure, none of S. Austins) did no otherwise worship Saints, than they did God himself; neither could he see in many things any difference between the opinion they had of Saints, and what the Gentiles had of their Gods. I cannot understand then, how S. Austins answer should justify that which he condemns: He denyes that there was an Invocation of Saints,

*Saints*, but only a *Commemoration* of them; the *Church of Rome* pleads for an *Invocation* of them, and condemns all those who deny it. So that his answer is very far from clearing the *Roman Church*, in the practice of *Invocation*, and the objection we make against it, that it doth parallel the *Heathen Idolatry*; for it grants, it would do so, if they gave to the *Saints* the worship due to *God*, of which he makes *Invocation* to be a part.

But after all this, can we imagine, that he should practise himself, contrary to his own doctrine? *Yes*, (saith he) *he made a prayer to S. Cyprian; let Blessed Cyprian therefore help us in our prayers.* But is there no difference to be made, between such an *Apostrophe* to a person in ones writing, and solemn supplication to him with all the solemnity of devotion, in the duties of Religious worship? If I should now say, Let *S. Austin* now help me in his prayers; while I am defending his constant opinion that *Invocation* is proper to *God* alone; would they take this for renouncing the *Protestant* doctrine, and embracing that of the *Church of Rome*? I doubt they would not think that I escaped the *Anathema* of the *Council of Trent* for all this. The Question between us, is not how far such wishes, rather than prayers, were thought allowable, being uttered occasionally, as *S. Austin* doth this to *S. Cyprian*; but whether solemn *Invocation* of *Saints*, in the duties of Religious Worship, as it is now practised in the *Roman Church*, were ever practised in *S. Austins* time? and this we utterly

*Aug. de  
ba t. c. Don.  
l. 7. c. 1.*



C. Faust.  
l. 20. c. 2.

Calv. Instit.  
l. 3. c. 20.  
n. 22. Bell.  
de Beatit.  
(a. Et. l. 1.  
c. 16.

deny. We do not say, that they did not then believe, that the Saints in Heaven did pray for them ; and that some of them did express their wishes, that they would pray particularly for them : We do not say, that some superstitions did not creep in, after the Anniversary meetings at the *Sepulchres* of the *Martyrs* grew in request ; for S. *Austin* himself saith, *that what they taught was one thing, and what they did bear with was another*, speaking of the customs used at those solemnities : But here we stand, and fix our foot against all opposition whatsoever, that there was no such doctrine or practice allowed in the *Church* at that time, as is owned and approved at this day, in the *Church* of *Rome*. But from S. *Austin* we are sent to *Calvin*, whose authority ( though never owned as infallible by us ) we need not fear in this point : and I cannot but wonder, if he saw the words in *Calvin* or *Bellarmin*, that he would produce them. For *Calvin* doth there say, *That the Council of Carthage did forbid praying to Saints, lest the publick prayers should be corrupted by such kind of addresses, Holy Peter pray for us*. If S. *Austin* were present in this *Council*, as my Adversary saith he was, I wonder what advantage it will be to him from *Calvins* saying, that the *Council* did condemn and forbid those prayers ; which were in use by some of the people. But it seems, he takes the peoples part against the *Council*, and S. *Austin* too ; and thinks it enough for them, to follow the practices condemned by *Councils* and *Fathers* ; which we are sure

sure they do; and are glad to find so ingenuous a confession of it. He may as well the next time bring *S. Austins* testimony for worshipping *Martyrs* and *Images*, because he saith, *he knew many who adored Sepulchres and Pictures*: and for the worship of *Angels*, because he saith, *he had heard of many, who had tryed to go to God by praying to Angels, and were thought worthy to fall into delusions.*

*De Morib. Eccl. Cath. c. 34. Confess. l. 10. c. 42.*

§. 16. But the strangest effort of all the rest, is what he hath reserved to the last place, *viz. That the charge of Idolatry against them must be vain and groundless, because if I be pressed close, I shall deny any one of these Negative points to be divine truths; viz. that honour is not to be given to the Images of Christ, and his Saints; that what appears to be bread in the Eucharist, is not the body of Christ; that it is not lawful to Invoke the Saints to pray for us.* But the answer to this is so easie, that it will not require much time to dispatch it. For I do assert it to be an Article of my faith, *That God alone is to be worshipped with divine and religious worship*: and he that cannot hence infer, that no created Being is to be worshipped, hath the name of reasonable creature given him to no purpose. What need we make *Negative Articles of faith*, where the *Affirmative* do necessarily imply them? If I believe that the *Scripture* is my only rule of faith, as I most firmly do; will any man that considers what he saith, require me to make *Negative Articles of faith*, that the *Pope* is not, *Tradition* is not, *Councils* are not, a private *Spirit* is not? for all these things

Of Negative points of faith.

are necessarily implied therein : And so for all particular doctrines, rejected by us upon this principle, we do not make them *Negative points of faith* ; but we therefore refuse the belief of them, because not contained in our only rule of faith : On this account we reject the *Popes Supremacy, Transubstantiation, Infallibility of the present Church in delivering Points of Faith, Purgatory, and other Fopperies* imposed upon the belief of *Christians*. So that the short resolution of our *faith* is this, that we ought to believe nothing as an Article of faith, but what *God* hath revealed : and that the compleat revelation of *Gods* will to us, is contained in the *Bible* : and the resolution of our worship, is into this principle, that *God* alone is to be worshipped with divine and religious worship ; and therefore whether they be *Saints* or *Angels, Sun, Moon and Stars, whether the Elements of a Sacrament, or of the World, whether Crosses and Reliques, or Woods and Fountains, or any sort of Images* ; in a word, no Creature whatsoever is to be worshipped with religious worship, because that is proper to *God* alone. And if this principle will excuse them from *Idolatry*, I desire him to make the best of it. And if he gives no more satisfactory answer hereafter, than he hath already done, the greatest charity I can use to those of that *Church*, is to wish them repentance, which I most heartily do.

The Doctrines of the Roman Church prejudicial to Piety. The Sacrament of Penance, as taught among them, destroys the necessity of a good life. The Doctrine of Purgatory takes away the care of it; as appears by the true stating it, and comparing that Doctrine with Protestants. How easie it is, according to them, for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. Purgatory dreadful to none, but poor and friendless. Sincerity of devotion hindred, by prayers in an unknown Tongue. The great absurdity of it manifested. The effects of our Ancestors devotion had been as great, if they had said their prayers in English. The language of prayer proved to be no indifferent thing, from S. Pauls arguments. No universal consent for prayers in an unknown tongue, by the confession of their own Writers. Of their doctrine of the efficacy of Sacraments; that it takes away all necessity of devotion, in the minds of the receivers. This complained of by Cassander and Arnaud; but proved against them, to be the doctrine of the Roman Church, by the Canons of the Council of Trent. The great easiness of getting Grace by their Sacraments. Of their discouraging

# 156 Of the hindrance of a good Life, and

the reading the Scriptures. A standing rule of devotion necessary. None so fit to give it, as God himself : This done by him in the Scriptures. All persons therefore concerned to read them. The Arguments against reading the Scriptures, would have held against the publishing them in a language known to the people. The dangers as great then, as ever have been since. The greatest prudence of the Roman Church is wholly to forbid the Scriptures ; being acknowledged by their wisest men, to be so contrary to their Interest. The confession of the Cardinals at Bononia, to that purpose. The avowed Practice of the Roman Church herein, directly contrary to that of the Primitive : although the reasons were as great then, from the danger of Heresies. This confessed by their own Writers.

Of the  
Sacrament  
of Penance  
destroying  
the necessi-  
ty of a  
good life.

§. 1. 2. **T**HE second Reason I gave why persons run so great a hazard of their salvation in the communion of the Roman Church was, because that Church is guilty of so great corruption of the Christian Religion, by opinions and practices which are very apt to hinder a good life, which is necessary to salvation. But,

1. *This necessity I said, was taken off by their making the Sacrament of Penance joyned with contrition, sufficient for salvation. Here he saith, That Protestants do make contrition alone, which is less, sufficient for salvation, and our Church allowing confession and absolution ( which make the Sacrament of Penance ) in case of trouble of conscience, they*

they being added to contrition, cannot make it of a malignant nature. To this I answer: That contrition alone is not by us made sufficient for salvation. For we believe, that as no man can be saved without true repentance, so that true repentance doth not lye meerly in contrition for sins. For godly sorrow in Scripture, is said, to work repentance to salvation, not to be repented of; and it cannot be the cause and effect both together. Repentance in Scripture implies a forsaking of sin, ( as it were very easie to prove, if it be thought necessary ) and without this we know not what ground any man hath to hope for the pardon of it, although he confess it, and be absolved a thousand times over; and have remorse in his mind for it, when he doth confess it. And therefore I had cause to say, that they of the Church of Rome destroy the necessity of a good life, when they declare a man to be in a state of salvation, if he hath a bare contrition for his sins, and confess them to the Priest, and be absolved by him. For to what end should a man put himself to the trouble of mortifying his passions and forsaking his sins? If he commits them again, he knows a present remedy, *toties quoties*; it is but confessing with sorrow, and upon absolution he is as whole, as if he had not sinned. And is it possible to imagine a doctrine that more effectually overthrows the necessity of a good life, than this doth? I cannot but think, if this doctrine were true, all the Precepts of Holiness in the Christian Religion were insignificant things: But this is a doctrine fitted to make all that

2 Cor. 7. 10



# 158 Of the hindrance of a good Life, and

that are *bad*, and willing to continue so, to be their *Profelytes*; when so cheap and easie a way of salvation is believed by them: especially if we enquire into the explication of this doctrine among the *Doctors* of that *Church*. I cannot better expresse this, than in the words of Bishop Taylor (whom he deservedly calls an *eminent leading man among the Protestants*) who after having mentioned their doctrines about contrition, "The sequel of all (he saith) is this, "that if a man live a wicked life for sixty or "eighty years together, yet if in the article of "his death, sooner than which God (say they) "hath not commanded him to repent, by be- "ing a little sorrowful for his sins, then re- "solving for the present that he will do so no "more; and though this sorrow hath in it no "love of God, but only a fear of Hell, and a "hope that God will pardon him; this, "if the Priest absolves him, doth instant- "ly pass him into a state of salvation. The "Priest with two Fingers and a Thumb "can do his work for him; only he must "be greatly prepared and disposed to re- "ceive it: greatly we say according to the "sense of the *Roman Church*; for he must be "atrite, or it were better, he were contrite; "one act of grief, a little one, and that not for "one sin more than for another, and this at the "end of a wicked long life, at the time of our "death will make all sure. Upon these terms, it "is a wonder that all wicked men in the world "are not Papists, where they may live so merri- "ly, and dye so securely, and are out of all "danger,

*Dissuasive.*  
p. 11. ch. 2.  
p. 81.

and  
to be  
way  
lly if  
trine  
not  
hop  
new  
after  
tri-  
his,  
pr  
e of  
ey)  
be-  
re-  
no  
no  
a  
is,  
at-  
he  
mb  
ust  
re-  
he  
be  
e;  
or  
he  
ur  
it  
d  
i-  
ll  
,

" danger, unless peradventure they dye very  
" suddenly, which because so very few do, the  
" venture is esteemed nothing, and it is a thou-  
" sand to one on the sinners side.

But we dare not flatter men so into eter-  
nal misery; we cannot but declare to them  
the necessity of a sincere repentance and holy  
life, in order to salvation: and that we can-  
not absolve those, whom God hath declared  
he will not absolve. Indeed for the satisfa-  
ction of truly penitent sinners, our Church  
approves of applying the Promises of Pardon  
in Scripture to the particular case of those  
persons; which is that we mean by *absolu-  
tion*. But if the Church of Rome pretend  
they can absolve whether God will or no,  
we must leave God and them to dispute that  
Point.

§. 2. 2. I said the care of a good life was  
taken off among them, by supposing an expia-  
tion of sin (by the prayers of the living) after  
death. No, saith he, it is rather apt to increase  
it; because of the temporal pains the sinner is to  
sustain after death, if there be not a perfect ex-  
piation of sin in this life by works of penance:  
and although he be ascertained by faith, that he  
may be halpen by the charitable suffrages of the  
faithful living, yet this is no more encourage-  
ment to him to sin, than it would be to a Spend-  
thrift to run into debt, and to be cast into prison,  
because he knows he may be relieved by the cha-  
rity of his friends. If he were sure there were no  
prison for him, that would be an encouragement  
indeed to play the Spend-thrift, and this he  
saith,

The do-  
ctrine of  
Purgatory  
takes away  
the care of  
a good life;

*faith, is the case of the Protestants in denial of Purgatory.* One would think by this answer, we Protestants had a very pleasant Religion, and that we held nothing that could affright a sinner from continuing in his sins, because we destroy *Purgatory* : I pray, Madam, ask him whether he be in earnest, that this is the case of the Protestants in the denial of *Purgatory* ; that the sinner is sure there is no prison for him. Do the Protestants believe that there is no Hell, or that Hell is no prison, or that it is less terrible than *Purgatory* : We had thought there had been something more dreadful in the torments of Hell, than in the flames of *Purgatory*. But if our plain doctrine, that every impenitent sinner must expect no less than eternal vengeance in another world, will not prevail upon men to leave their sins, and lead a good life ; can we imagine a groundless fiction of *Purgatory* should ever do it ? Especially, considering the true stating of the doctrine of *Purgatory* among them, by which we shall easily discern what obligation it layes upon men to *Holiness* of life. “ There  
 “ are (say they) two sorts of sins which men  
 “ are guilty of, some of which are in their own  
 “ nature *venial*, and so do not deserve eternal  
 “ punishment, and for these a general and virtual repentance is sufficient : but there are  
 “ other which they call *mortal sins*, which have  
 “ a debt and obligation to eternal punishment  
 “ belonging to them ; but this *eternal punishment*  
 “ is changed into *temporal*, by the *Sacrament of Penance* ; but still this *temporal punishment*, must be undergone either in *this life*,  
 “ or

"or that to come; if a man do not satisfy in  
 "this life, and cannot get help enough out of  
 "the stock of the Church to do it for him;  
 "there is no remedy, to Purgatory he must go:  
 "and if he be not helped by his Friends on  
 "earth, God knows how long he may stay  
 "there; but then he is to blame that he took  
 "no more care for his soul when he lived; if  
 "not by a holy life, yet by leaving no more  
 "to those whose Office it should be, to procure  
 "him a deliverance thence. Judge now, *Madam*,  
 if this be not a very frightful doctrine, especially  
 to those, who are *poor and friendless*. But in  
 case a man be rich enough, to provide *Masses* to  
 be said for his soul; and that he hath a good  
*stock of Indulgences* before hand, for some *thou-*  
*sands* of years, he may make a pretty tolerable  
 shift in Purgatory, especially in these last *Ages* of  
 the world; wherein it is probable, it may not  
 be near so long to the day of judgement (when  
 the final sentence is to be pronounced) as he  
 hath got years of *Indulgences* already. I pray  
 what need a person be afraid of, that lives a  
 very bad life, according to these principles?  
 Must he suffer for his *Original sin*? No, that,  
 guilt and punishment and all, is clear done  
 away in *Baptism*. Must he suffer for his *Venial*  
*sins*? That were strange, if he had never any  
*general repentance* for them. Need he be afraid  
 of the dreadful sentence of the day of judge-  
 ment, *Goye cursed into everlasting flames*? He is  
 a Fool indeed, that by a little present *contrition*  
 and *confession*, will not obtain *absolution* from a  
*Priest*; and then in a trice the *eternal flames*  
 are

the reading the Scriptures. A standing rule of devotion necessary. None so fit to give it, as God himself : This done by him in the Scriptures. All persons therefore concerned to read them. The Arguments against reading the Scriptures, would have held against the publishing them in a language known to the people. The dangers as great then, as ever have been since. The greatest prudence of the Roman Church is wholly to forbid the Scriptures ; being acknowledged by their wisest men, to be so contrary to their Interest. The confession of the Cardinals at Bononia, to that purpose. The avowed Practice of the Roman Church herein, directly contrary to that of the Primitive : although the reasons were as great then, from the danger of Heresies. This confessed by their own Writers.

Of the  
Sacrament  
of Penance  
destroying  
the necessity  
of a  
good life.

§. 1. 2. **T**HE second Reason I gave why persons run so great a hazard of their salvation in the communion of the Roman Church was, because that Church is guilty of so great corruption of the Christian Religion, by opinions and practices which are very apt to hinder a good life, which is necessary to salvation. But,

1. This necessity I said, was taken off by their making the Sacrament of Penance joyned with contrition, sufficient for salvation. Here he saith, That Protestants do make contrition alone, which is less, sufficient for salvation, and our Church allowing confession and absolution ( which make the Sacrament of Penance ) in case of trouble of conscience, they

they being added to contrition, cannot make it of  
a malignant nature. To this I answer: That  
contrition alone is not by us made sufficient  
for salvation. For we believe, that as no man  
can be saved without true repentance, so that  
true repentance doth not lye meerly in contri-  
tion for sins. For godly sorrow in Scripture, is  
said, to work repentance to salvation, not to be re-  
pented of; and it cannot be the cause and effect  
both together. Repentance in Scripture im-  
plies a forsaking of sin, ( as it were very easie to  
prove, if it be thought necessary ) and without  
this we know not what ground any man hath to  
hope for the pardon of it, although he confess it,  
and be absolved a thousand times over; and have  
remorse in his mind for it, when he doth con-  
fess it. And therefore I had cause to say, that  
they of the Church of Rome destroy the neces-  
sity of a good life, when they declare a man to  
be in a state of salvation, if he hath a bare  
contrition for his sins, and confess them to the  
Priest, and be absolved by him. For to what  
end should a man put himself to the trouble  
of mortifying his passions and forsaking his  
sins? If he commits them again, he knows a  
present remedy, *toties quoties*; it is but con-  
fessing with sorrow, and upon absolution he is  
as whole, as if he had not sinned. And is it  
possible to imagine a doctrine that more effe-  
ctually overthrows the necessity of a good life,  
than this doth? I cannot but think, if this do-  
ctrine were true, all the Precepts of Holiness  
in the Christian Religion were insignificant  
things: But this is a doctrine fitted to make all  
that

2 Cor. 7. 10.



Dissuasive.

p. 1. ch. 2.

p. 81.

that are *bad*, and willing to continue so; to be their *Profelytes*; when so cheap and easie a way of salvation is believed by them: especially if we enquire into the explication of this doctrine among the *Doctors* of that *Church*. I cannot better express this, than in the words of Bishop Taylor (whom he deservedly calls *an eminent leading man among the Protestants*) who after having mentioned their doctrines about contrition, "The sequel of all (he saith) is this, "that if a man live a wicked life for sixty or "eighty years together, yet if in the article of "his death, sooner than which God (say they) "hath not commanded him to repent, by be- "ing a little sorrowful for his sins, then re- "solving for the present that he will do so no "more, and though this sorrow hath in it no "love of God, but only a fear of Hell, and a "hope that God will pardon him; this, "if the Priest absolves him, doth instant- "ly pass him into a state of salvation. The "Priest with two Fingers and a Thumb "can do his work for him; only he must "be greatly prepared and disposed to re- "ceive it: greatly we say according to the "sense of the *Roman Church*; for he must be "atrite, or it were better, he were contrite; "one act of grief, a little one, and that not for "one sin more than for another, and this at the "end of a wicked long life, at the time of our "death will make all sure. Upon these terms, it "is a wonder that all wicked men in the world "are not Papists, where they may live so merri- "ly, and dye so securely, and are out of all  
" danger,

"danger, unless peradventure they dye very suddenly, which because so very few do, the venture is esteemed nothing, and it is a thousand to one on the sinners side.

But we dare not flatter men so into eternal misery; we cannot but declare to them the necessity of a sincere repentance and holy life, in order to salvation: and that we cannot absolve those, whom God hath declared he will not absolve. Indeed for the satisfaction of truly penitent sinners, our Church approves of applying the Promises of Pardon in Scripture to the particular case of those persons; which is that we mean by *absolution*. But if the Church of Rome pretend they can absolve whether God will or no, we must leave God and them to dispute that Point.

§. 2. 2. I said the care of a good life was taken off among them, by supposing an expiation of sin (by the prayers of the living) after death. No, saith he, *it is rather apt to increase it; because of the temporal pains the sinner is to sustain after death, if there be not a perfect expiation of sin in this life by works of penance: and although he be ascertained by faith, that he may be holpen by the charitable suffrages of the faithful living, yet this is no more encouragement to him to sin, than it would be to a Spend-thrift to run into debt, and to be cast into prison, because he knows he may be relieved by the charity of his friends. If he were sure there were no prison for him, that would be an encouragement indeed to play the Spend-thrift, and this he* saith,

The doctrine of Purgatory takes away the care of a good life;

faith, is the case of the Protestants in denial of  
*Purgatory*. One would think by this answer,  
 we Protestants had a very pleasant Religion, and  
 that we held nothing that could affright a sinner  
 from continuing in his sins, because we destroy  
*Purgatory* : I pray, Madam, ask him whether  
 he be in earnest, that this is the case of the Pro-  
 testants in the denial of *Purgatory* ; that the sinner  
 is sure there is no prison for him. Do the Prote-  
 stants believe that there is no Hell, or that Hell  
 is no prison, or that it is less terrible than *Pur-*  
*gatory* : We had thought there had been some-  
 thing more dreadful in the torments of Hell, than  
 in the flames of *Purgatory*. But if our plain  
 doctrine, that every impenitent sinner must ex-  
 pect no less than eternal vengeance in another  
 world, will not prevail upon men to leave their  
 sins, and lead a good life ; can we imagine a  
 groundless fiction of *Purgatory* should ever do  
 it ? Especially, considering the true stating of  
 the doctrine of *Purgatory* among them, by  
 which we shall easily discern what obligation it  
 layes upon men to *Holiness* of life. " There  
 " are (say they) two sorts of sins which men  
 " are guilty of, some of which are in their own  
 " nature *venial*, and so do not deserve eternal  
 " punishment, and for these a general and ver-  
 " tual repentance is sufficient : but there are  
 " other which they call *mortal sins*, which have  
 " a debt and obligation to eternal punishment  
 " belonging to them ; but this *eternal punish-*  
 " *ment* is changed into *temporal*, by the *Sacra-*  
 " *ment of Penance* ; but still this *temporal pu-*  
 " *nishment*, must be undergone either in *this life*,  
 " or

"or that to come; if a man do not satisfy in  
 "this life, and cannot get help enough out of  
 "the stock of the Church to do it for him;  
 "there is no remedy, to Purgatory he must go:  
 "and if he be not helped by his Friends on  
 "earth, God knows how long he may stay  
 "there; but then he is to blame that he took  
 "no more care for his soul when he lived; if  
 "not by a holy life, yet by leaving no more  
 "to those whose Office it should be, to procure  
 "him a deliverance thence. Judge now, *Madam*,  
 if this be not a very frightful doctrine, especially  
 to those, who are *poor and friendless*. But in  
 case a man be rich enough, to provide *Masses* to  
 be said for his soul; and that he hath a good  
 stock of *Indulgences* before hand, for some thou-  
 sands of years, he may make a pretty tolerable  
 shift in Purgatory, especially in these last *Ages* of  
 the world; wherein it is probable, it may not  
 be near so long to the day of judgement (when  
 the final sentence is to be pronounced) as he  
 hath got years of *Indulgences* already. I pray  
 what need a person be afraid of, that lives a  
 very bad life, according to these principles?  
 Must he suffer for his *Original sin*? No, that,  
 guilt and punishment and all, is clear done  
 away in *Baptism*. Must he suffer for his *Venial*  
*sins*? That were strange, if he had never any  
*general repentance* for them. Need he be afraid  
 of the dreadful sentence of the day of judge-  
 ment, *Goye cursed into everlasting flames*? He is  
 a Fool indeed, that by a little present *contrition*  
 and *confession*, will not obtain *absolution* from a  
 Priest; and then in a trice the *eternal flames*  
 are

are extinguished, and only some *temporal* punishment succeeds in the *room* of them. But it would seem somewhat hard to a voluptuous man however to be put to severe *penances*; is there no remedy in this case? Yea, there is a *stock* in the *Church*; and if he will not procure help for himself thence by some plenary *Indulgences*, if he will not bear it here, he must in another world. What then? Is he past all hope of remedy there? That is according to his *Purse* and *Friends*. *How easie is it for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God?* But we have no such easie way of escaping the miseries of another life: we dare not tell men they may be relieved there by *Masses* and *Sacrifices*, and I know not what: our doctrine is plain and agreeable to the most obvious and easie sense of the *Gospel*, if men be good here, they shall be happy afterwards; if they be bad, and continue so, they shall be certainly miserable, and unavoidably so. But for those who are neither good nor bad, (if any such can be) neither sincere nor hypocrites, neither penitent nor impenitent, we leave them to take care of them: our Saviour hath only declared, that those who are good, sincere, and penitent, shall be happy; those who are otherwise, must be miserable: if they have found out some wayes for them to escape notwithstanding, at their peril be it, who relye upon them. But for others, we understand no more how punishment in another life should remain after the guilt of sin is pardoned, than how a shadow should continue, when the body is gone: for punishment follows;

follows guilt, as the shadow the body. And if pardon of sin signifies any thing, it is taking away the punishment we were obnoxious to by reason of sin. But how that man should be said to have his *debt forgiven*, who is cast into Prison for it: only whereas he might have lain and rotted there, his *Creditor* tells him, he shall endure the same misery, but he shall escape at last, is a thing no man would believe, who suffered in such a case. He might indeed say, that he did not exercise the utmost rigour of *Justice*, but would hardly be brought to magnify the infinite clemency and kindness of his *Creditor*. But we that desire to understand the way of salvation as it is delivered by our *Lord Jesus Christ*, and to be saved in that way, cannot for our hearts understand any more by his doctrine, but that men shall be saved, if they believe and obey his doctrine, and shall be condemned, if they do it not. We find nothing of *half saving* and *half damning* men, such as the *state of Purgatory* is believed to be in the *Church of Rome*. For the pains of persons therein, are said to be as great as of the damned in Hell; and yet all this while *God* is their *Friend*, and they are sure to be saved. They had need in such a case to call in the help of their *Friends* on earth, if *God* be so ill a *Friend* in Heaven.

And can he not believe, that it is a far greater encouragement to a *Spend-thrift* to be told indeed of a dreadful Prison, but such as if he leaves but money behind him to imploy his friends in begging his pardon, he shall be surely



surely delivered; than to be assured if he continues his folly, there will be no redemption or hopes of deliverance, when he is once cast into it. I dare appeal to any one who can but understand what we speak of, whether of these two, is the more probable way of reclaiming a man from riotous courses? but that which is beyond this, is, that the one is most certainly true, the other but a meer figment of the brains of men, who have contrived a way to bring wicked men to Heaven at last, although somewhat the farther way about, and it must cost them dear for their *Friends* to help them through.

Sincerity  
of devotion  
hindered  
by prayers  
in an un-  
known  
Tongue.

§. 3. 3. After I had shewed how much the necessity, and care of a good life, were obstructed by the principles of the *Roman Church*; I proceeded to shew, how the sincerity of devotion was hindered among them, by several particulars.

1. By prayers in a language which many understand not. To this he answers, If I speak of private prayers, all *Catholicks* are taught to say them in their Mother Tongue: If of the publick prayers of the Church, he understands not why it may not be done with as much sincerity of devotion, the people joyning their intention and particular prayers with the Priest, as their Embassador to God, as if they understood him; he is sure the effects of a sincere devotion, for nine hundred years together, which this manner of worship produced in this Nation, were much different from those we have seen since the reducing the publick Liturgie into English; for which he instances in building  
and

and endowing Churches, Colledges, Religious houses, and the conversion of several Nations by English Missionaries. But this, he saith, is a matter of Discipline, and not to be regulated by the fancies of private men, but the judgement of the Church: and withal is confessed by some Protestants, that most Sects of Christians have the Scriptures, Liturgies and Rituals in a Tongue unknown, but to the Learned, and therefore according to St. Austin, it is insolent madness to dispute that which is frequented by the whole Church through the world. For our more distinct proceeding in answer to this, three things are to be considered: 1. Whether praying in a known or unknown tongue, do more conduce to devotion? 2. Whether this whole matter be a thing left in the power of the Church to determine? 3. Whether prayers in an unknown tongue, be universally received in all other parts of the Christian world?

1. Whether of these conduce more to devotion, is our main enquiry. And if praying in an unknown tongue doth so, I wonder he tells us, that all Catholicks are taught to say them in their Mother-tongue: Why so I pray? Is it that by understanding what they speak, their minds might be more attentive, and their affections more raised in the desires of the things they pray for? And will not the same arguments more hold for publick prayer, wherein all the Congregation are to joyn together? So that their private prayers condemn their publick, unless Latin in the Church be of greater force, than uttered in a Closet.

O

But

Preface to  
the Poly-  
glott Bible,  
1655.

But can it enter into the minds of any men, who consider what the end of meeting together to pray is, that such an end should as much, or more, be attained, where people know not what they say, as where they do? If all the business of *Christian Worship* were only to patter over a few words (as if there were no difference between *prayers* and *charms*) what he saith, were to some purpose: but that is so dishonourable a thing to *Christian Religion*, that it is hard to say, whether they have more corrupted the *doctrine* or the *devotion* of the *Christian Church*. If I saw a company of *Indians* met together, with their *Priest* among them, using many antick gestures and Mimical postures, and speaking many words which the people muttered after him, but understood not what they said; I might probably suspect they were *conjuring*, but should hardly believe them, if they called that *praying*. I could not but enquire of them, what they meant by *praying*? If they told me, saying so many hard words, which they understood not, I had done with them, but should shrewdly suspect the *knavery* of their *Priests*. If they told me, by *praying* they meant, *expressing their desires of the things they stood in need of, to the God they worshipped*; I could not but ask of them, whether it were not necessary for them to know what it was they asked, or how could they desire they knew not what? Or whether the *God* they worshipped, understood only that *one tongue*, and so they were said to speak to him, in his own language?

This

This I confels, were a sufficient reason; and in that case the people were to be pitied, if they could not learn that tongue themselves. But supposing all languages equally known to him we make our addressees to, why should not the people use that, which they understand themselves? Are their prayers like counterfeit *Jewels*, that the less they understand them, the better they like them? It may justly give men some suspicion, that there are not fair dealings, where so little light is allowed to judge by: and *that devotion* commended most, which *Ignorance* is the Mother of. We think it as unreasonable, to desire the people to say *Amen* to prayers they know not the meaning of, as for men to set their hands to *Petitions* without reading what is contained in them. It is a great chance if they do not mistake, to their own great prejudice, and do what they repent of afterwards. We declare, that our meeting together to worship *God*, is to joyn together our hearty prayers; which the more the people understand, the better their minds are satisfied in what they desire, and the more fervent will their supplications be. If it be enough for *some* to understand them, it may as well be enough for *some* to pray them; if their *prayers* who understand them, prevail for those who do not, then it is no matter at all whether they be *present* or no; unless the efficacy of the others prayers be confined within the walls where they meet. And if *their* prayers be most prevalent, who understand most, then it were ten times better, if all the

people understood what they prayed for : and it must necessarily follow, that praying in an unknown tongue, is a great obstructor of the devotion of the people, and that which hinders the efficacy of their prayers. If it be enough for the people to be present, and to pray their own private prayers there in publick, to what End is there any publick *Liturgie* at all? Why should not all of them be at their private prayers together? Why should the *Priest* with his *Jargon* of hard words interrupt them? for it is no other, to them who know not what he saith ; and why may they not as well say their private prayers at the chiming of Bells, as at the words of a *Priest*? for they understand both alike, and both seem to sound as such wise people will have them.

But he tells us, *The effects of this devotion were admirable in the charitable and pious works of our Ancestors, who used this way so many Ages together.* I pray Madam, ask him, whether he really thinks, they would have done none of those things, if they had said their prayers in *English*? If they would not, I do much admire the force of the *Latin Tongue*: If they would, then that was not the cause, and these things do not prove what they were intended for : And so *Tenderden Steeple* was not the cause of *Goodwin Sands*. We do not go about to disparage our *Ancestors*, we bless *God* for the good they did ; but do not think that doth oblige us to think them infallible in their opinions ; or without fault in all their practices : But our true

*Ancestors*

*Ancestors in Religion*, are *Christ* and his *Apostles* and the *Primitive Church*; and all these are yielded to be of our side, by the most zealous *Adversaries* we have: and give us leave to think their examples ought to have more force with us, than any other whatsoever. We pretend not, to be wiser than they were; nor to know what is more expedient for *devotion* than they: We are content to be condemned for error, with those who are by all Christians acknowledged to be *infallible*; and to want *devotion*, where we follow the examples of the most *holy persons* the world ever had. If the practice of the *Primitive Church* in this point, were not given us for the first six hundred years and more, it were an easie matter to evince it by expresse testimonies: but that is not the thing insisted on, but that this is a matter of *Discipline*, and the *Church* hath the power to determine it in one *Age* as well as another.

§ 4. Which is the next thing to be considered. Here I shall desire but two principles to resolve this by. 1. That the *Churches power* is only to *edification* and not to destruction; for this was as much as the *Apostles* challenged to themselves, and I hope none dare challenge more: but this is a principle of natural reason, that no power in a society ought to be extended beyond the benefit of it, or to contradict the end or design of it. 2. That the *Apostles* were the most competent Judges of what made for the *Edification* of the Church; and what they declared to tend to that end, no succeeding persons ought to condemn as contrary to it. This de-

The language of prayer, no matter of discipline. 2Cor. 10, 8.



# 170 Of the hindrance of a good Life; and

pendes upon that infallible *Spirit* which the *Apostles* had, and the mighty care in them of the *Churches* good; which we cannot think any since them, can exceed them in. These things being supposed, we are only to consider, whether the *Apostle* hath not delivered his sense in our present subject, viz. that prayers in an unknown tongue are contrary to the *Edification* of the *Church*? It seems somewhat hard to us to be put to prove a matter so evident, from

1 Cor. 14. St. *Paul*: and we could not imagine, any would go about to reconcile prayers in an unknown tongue, to that Discourse of his, but those who think they can reconcile the worship of *Images*, to the second Commandment. The abuse St. *Paul* corrects, with so much sharpness, in the *Church* of *Corinth*, was an impertinent use of the gift of *Tongues*; such I mean as did not tend to the *Edification* of the *Church*: as for Instance, one man made a long Harangue in *Hebrew*, and pleased himself mightily in the sound of the words, when not a person there, it may be, understood a word that he said; another of a sudden begins a Hymn, in *Syriack* or *Caldee*; another falls a praying, in *Ethiopick*; but all this while, no man interprets what these several men said: to what purpose is all this, saith the *Apostle*; only

1 Cor. 14. 20. 23. for by-standers, to think they were *Children* or *mad men*: could they imagine *God* gave them these gifts of tongues, to make uncouth and insignificant sounds with, where the people were met together for the worship of *God*? If they were so much tickled with the noise, they might make

make that at home, and not in the Church of V. 18.  
*God, where all things ought to be done to Edifica-*  
*tion.* For they met together as a company of V. 26.  
 reasonable men to receive some benefit that V. 3, 3, 4,  
 might be common to them all; and therefore S. &c.  
 the gift of tongues, in a society of Christians,  
 could be of no use without an *Interpreter*.  
 But lest all this should seem to be spoken only  
 of instruction of the people, and not of prayer  
 to God, and that the case were not alike in  
 both these, he adds, *If I pray in an unknown* V. 14.  
*tongue, my Spirit prayeth, but my understanding*  
*is unfruitful.* i. e. I may exercise my gift, but  
 it is to no use at all in the Church. How so?  
 "One of the *Roman Church* might have told  
 "St. Paul, when I see him pray, and know  
 "what he is doing, may I not joyn my intenti-  
 "on of praying with his, as our Embassadour,  
 "and pray my own private prayers at the same  
 "time that he doth? I know the substance of  
 "what he designs to pray for; and although I  
 "do not know his meaning, God knows mine:  
 "and therefore I can see no hindrance of  
 "devotion at all in this, that when one begins  
 "a prayer in an unknown tongue, all the  
 "people fall upon their knees, and pray too:  
 This is the plain answer they must give St. Paul,  
 who justifie prayers in an unknown tongue.  
 But we are content with St. Pauls judge-  
 ment in this case, and the reason of it;  
 that the acts belonging to the worship of  
 God in the Church ought to be of so common  
 concernment, that all may have a share in  
 them, and receive the benefit by them:

Or else they were far better hold their peace. It is very impertinent to say, that the *Apostle* speaks only of extraordinary gifts, and not of the settled and ordinary devotions of the *Church*. For the case is the same, where the language is not understood, whether it be spoken by a *Miracle* or not: And the *Apostle* layes down a general rule from this particular case, *that all things must be done to edifying*, which it appears he judges the use of an unknown language not to be. And if after all this, it be in the *Churches* power to reverse the *Apostles* decree as to praying in an unknown language, they may use the very same power, as to all other Offices of *Religion*, and may command preaching to be in a tongue as unknown as praying; that so the people may meet together, and pray, and hear Sermons, and understand never a word, for their great edification. Unless among us *God* should put it into their hearts to speak *English*, whether they would or no, as was once said by an ignorant person on the like occasion. If all that is intended in the prayers of the people, be only *an intention to pray*, whatever the words be, *Abracadabra* might serve to pray with, as well as *Ave Maria*, and the old Womans saying of it, *Ave Maria gratia plinam dams ticum, benedicta tu in mulabz yeth Benedictus frictus frentis tui, sweet Jesus, Amen*; was as effectual a prayer if she meant it so, as could be uttered by the most skillful Priest.

§. 5. 3. But the universal consent of the Christian Church is pleaded for this practice, Protestants only excepted; and therefore it is insolent madness in them to oppose it, as S. Austin saith; but we had however rather follow S. Paul, who saith it were madness to practice it. But I assure you, Madam, we are not to take all things for granted which are told us by them, concerning the opinions and practices of the Eastern Churches: (as I may in time discover) but in this, he saith, our own Protestant Authors of the Bible of many Languages Lond. A. D. 1655. do confess that in most of the Sects of the Christians, they have not only the Scriptures: but also the Liturgies and Rituals in a tongue unknown but to the learned: from which he concludes, this to be an universal practice both in the Primitive Greek and Latin Churches, and in these latter Sects of Eastern Christians. It were a very pleasant enquiry, How in the Primitive Greek and Latin Churches the Service could be in an unknown Language, when Greek and Latin were the Mother Tongues of those Churches? Doth he think they did not understand their own Mother Tongues? How many of their own Writers have confessed, that in the Primitive Churches all publick Offices of Religion were performed in the proper language of every Countrey; which in express words is affirmed by Origen against Celsus: and some of the Church of Rome have been so ingenuous to confess, it were much better that custom were restored again. So Cas-

No universal consent, for prayers in an unknown tongue.

Orig. c. Cel.  
l. 8. p. 402.

Cassian.  
consult.  
art. 24.

proved

# 174 Of the hindrance of a good Life, and

proved for it said, *he learned this doctrine from S. Paul, 1 Cor. 14.* And the Title of the twenty eighth Chapter of *Cassander his Liturgicks* is, *That the Antients read the Canonical Prayer, and the consecration of the Eucharist, so as the people did understand it and say Amen.* *Lyra* saith, *That all publick Offices of Religion were, in the Primitive Church, performed in the Vulgar Tongue.* So that it was not upon the account of any sanctity in the *Greek* or *Latin*, that they were more used, but because they were more generally understood. On which account *Pope Innocent the third* gave strict command, that where people of different Languages did inhabit, care should be taken to provide men able to administer Sacraments, and instruct them in their several tongues; which Decree of his is inserted in the *Canon Law*; and was not intended out of honour to the *Greek* and *Latin* Tongues only, but for the advantage of the people. So likewise *John the eighth* yielded to the *Prince of Moravia*, to have their *Liturgie* in the *Slavonian* Tongue, because *S. Paul* saith, *Let every Tongue praise the Lord*; which is the reason given by the *Pope* in his Letter extant in *Baronius*: and not meerly on the account of a present necessity, for want of *Priests* who could read *Latin*, as *Bellarmin* conjectures; for he appoints it should be first read in the *Slavonian* Tongue. If this were then a *Catholick practice*, these *Popes* were hugely to blame to give way to the breach of it. And *Walafridus Strabo* saith, in his time among the *Scythians*, the divine Offices were

*Lyra* 14]

1 Cor. 14.

*Baron. Tom.*

10. A. 880.

n. 16.

*Walafrid.*

*Strabo de*

*re. Ec. les.*

c. 7.

were

were performed in the German Tongue ; which was common to them and the Germans. But our own Protestant Writers, he saith, own this to be in use in the most Sects of Christians. I have endeavoured to find this confession in the Preface cited by him, but I cannot meet with it ; and the Learned Bishop who writ it, understood these things, better than to write so. It is true he saith ( not in the Preface, but Proleg. 13. n. 19. ) that the Syriack Tongue is the Tongue of the Learned, among the Christians throughout the East ; as appears by the Liturgies and divine Offices, which are almost every where performed in this Language ; although it be the Mother-tongue now, only to a few about Mount Libanus : But any one who enquires into a Catholick practice, must not meerly give an account of the most Eastern Christians of whom he there speaks. For there are many considerable Churches besides these, which do to this day use their own language in their Liturgies ; as their own Writers attest : But I need not go about to prove this, since Bellarmine confesseth, That the Armenians, Ethiopians, Egyptians, Russians and others do it ; but he saith, he is no more moved by these, than by the practice of Protestants : but we cannot but be moved so far by it, as thereby to see that the practice of the Church of Rome is no more a Catholick practice, than it is founded either on Scripture or Reason.

§. 6. I said the sincerity of devotion was obstructed, by making the efficacy of Sacraments to depend on the bare Administration, whether our minds be prepared for them or not. This, he saith,

Of their doctrine of the efficacy of Sacraments.



faith, he had rather look upon as a mistake, than a calumny, having never read any Council wherein this doctrine is defined; and as to the Sacrament of Penance (which he supposeth I chiefly mean) the Council of Trent hath determined it to be a calumny for any to say, that according to their doctrine it doth confer grace, without the good motion of the receiver. Madam, I either expected he should have understood the doctrine of his own party better, or been more ingenious in confessing it. For my quarrel had no particular respect to the *Sacrament of Penance*, more than to any other *Sacrament* of theirs; and if I can make it appear, that it is their doctrine, that the efficacy of Sacraments doth not depend upon the preparation of the receiver, but the bare Administration, or the *external work done*, I need not add much to shew how much this doth obstruct the *sincerity of devotion*. It had been an opinion long received in the Schools, although with different wayes of explication, that the *Sacraments* of the new Law differed from those of the old in this, that the efficacy of those of the old Law in conferring grace, did depend upon what they called *opus operantis*, i. e. the *faith and devotion* of the receiver of them; but that the *Sacraments* of the new Law did confer grace *ex opere operato*, i. e. *by the thing it self*, without any dependance therein upon the internal motion or preparation of mind in him that did partake of them. This doctrine began to be in a particular manner applied to the *Mass*, because that contained *Christ* in a more especial

especial way than any other *Sacrament*; thence it was believed and asserted, that it did produce saving effects as remission of sins and true grace, although we should suppose it an impossible thing, that no man in the world had any true Grace; as Baptism takes away original sin, and gives grace to the Infant baptized, whatever the sins of men are. These are the expressions of one of their profound Doctors. And therefore they distinguished the efficacy of the work done, not barely from the dignity of the Priest, and the merit of the receiver, but from the devotion and preparation of mind with which the receiver came. Which Bellarmin himself cannot deny, only two things he saith to take off the odium of it. One is, That they do not wholly exclude them, but only from the efficacy of Sacraments; which, he saith, is effectually proved by the case of Infants, that it doth not depend upon any quality of the receiver: the other, That though the Mass, as a Sacrament, may not profit those who are not duly prepared, yet as a Sacrifice it may. By which these things are evident: 1. That the efficacy of the Sacraments in conferring grace, doth not at all depend upon the qualification of the receiver. 2. That although, upon other accounts, some dispositions are required in adult persons, to receive the benefit of them as Sacraments; yet the effect of the Mass as a Sacrifice, is not at all hindered by want of them. If it were a thing possible, I would willingly understand what they mean by Sacraments conferring grace *ex opere operato* (which are not only the express terms

Gabr. Biel.  
sup. Canon.  
Missæ lect.  
26. lit. 6.

Bell. de ef-  
fectu Sa-  
cram. l. 2.  
c. 1.

of

*Concil. Trident. Sess. 7. Can. 8.* of the Council of Trent, but an *Anathema* is denounced against any one who denies it.) For the manner of it is declared by themselves, to be unintelligible ; and no wonder, for they suppose *Grace* to be contained in the *Sacraments* (and it is defined with an *Anathema* by the Council of Trent ) and by the *Sacrament* of it self it is conveyed into the heart of a man : But whether it be contained as in an *univocal cause*, as in an *instrument*, or as in a *sign* ; Whether it be conferred by the *Sacraments* as *Physical*, or as *Moral Causes* ; Whether by a *power inherent* in the *Sacraments* themselves, or a *power assiscent* concurring with the *Sacraments* ; Whether it be conveyed as *Physick* in a *Cup*, or as *Heat* to *Water* by a *red hot Iron*, or as *healing* to the persons who touched the hemm of our Saviours Garment ; Whether they produce only a next disposition to grace, or not the grace it self, but the union of grace with the soul, or ( which is the most common opinion ) that *Physical* action whereby grace is produced which doth truly, really and physically depend upon the *Sacraments* (meaning thereby the external action of administering them ) These are looked on as great Riddles among them, and so they ought to be : But these things, say they, need not be determined, nor the manner of the thing be understood, no more than those who were miraculously healed, did the manner of the cure, a very proper instance, if the matter of fact were as evident in one, as it is in the other. But if I should say, that the wearing a Cap of a certain

tain

tain figure would certainly convey wit and understanding into a man, and the meer putting it on was enough to produce the effect : and a person should tell me it was an unintelligible thing, were it enough think you, as *Bellarmin* doth in this case, to run to other mysteries of faith and nature which are as hard as that? By this consequence, no man ought to be charged with believing absurd and unreasonable things; and the Trinity and Resurrection shall serve to justify the *Fables* of the *Alcoran* as well as the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, and the efficacy of the Sacraments *ex opere operata*. We could easily dispense with the barbarous terms and ungrammaticalness of them, if there were any thing under them, that were capable of being understood : But that is not the greatest quarrel I have with this doctrine; for I say still, notwithstanding all the tricks and arts which have been used to palliate it, it doth obstruct the sincerity of devotion, by making the exercise of it by the preparation of our minds for the use of Sacraments to be unnecessary. For if *Grace* be effectually conferred by the force of the bare external action, which is acknowledged by them all, what need can there be of a due preparation of mind by the exercise of faith, prayer, repentance, &c. in order to the receiving the benefit of them? Yes, say they, *the internal disposition of the mind is necessary to remove impediments, and to make a subject capable of receiving it : as dryness in wood to make it burn : but what do they mean by this Internal disposition of mind? the exercise of*

the

the graces and duties I mentioned? by no means: but that there be no mortal sin unconfessed; that there be no actual opposition in the *Will* to the *Sacrament*, as for instance, if a man when he is going to be baptized, resolves with himself that he will not be baptized, or while he is baptizing, that he will not believe in *Father, Son* and *Holy Ghost*, nor renounce the *Devil* and all his works. This indeed they say hinders the efficacy of *Sacraments*, but not the bare want of devotion; and if want of devotion doth not hinder *Grace* being received, what arguments can men use to persuade persons to it? Who will undergo so strict an examination of himself, and endeavour to raise his mind to a due preparation for the participation of *Sacraments*; if he knows before hand that he shall certainly receive *Grace* by the *Sacraments* without it? And surely they will not say, but what doth obstruct the exercise of these things, doth very much hinder devotion. If men had a mind to banish it out of the world, they could never do it under a fairer pretence, than that *Grace*, and consequently the effects of it may be obtained without it: and I do not question, but this doctrine hath been one of the great causes of the corrupt lives of those who believe it? From hence the trade of saying *Masses* hath proved so gainful, and such multitudes of them have been procured for the benefit of particular persons; this being a much easier way of procuring *Grace* and *Salvation*, than fervent prayer, constant endeavours after a Holy Life, Mortification, Watchfulness

fulness and other things we make necessary to enjoy the benefit of what Christ hath done and suffered for us?

And these things have been complained of, by persons of their own communion who have had any zeal for devotion, and the practice of true Goodness. *Cassander*, although he denies the doctrine of the efficacy of the Sacraments without the devotion of the receiver, to be the received doctrine of the Roman Church, yet cannot deny, but such a Pharisaical opinion (as he calls it) had possessed the minds of many of those who did celebrate Masses, and were present at them: and that too just an occasion was given to those who upbraided them with that opinion; because of the multitude of Masses which were celebrated by impure and wicked Priests, meerly for gain; at which those who are present, think they depart from them with a great deal of sanctity, although they never once resolve to change their lives, but return from thence immediately to their former sins. *Mons. Arnauld* in his Book of Frequent Communion (written upon that occasion) confesseth, that some in the Roman Church, by their doctrine and instructions given to persons, did destroy all preparations, as unnecessary to the partaking the benefits of the Eucharist; and that the worst persons might come without fear to it. And that the most required as necessary by them, is only the Sacrament of Penance to recover Grace by, which, he saith, they reduce to bare confession; and that this by them is not made necessary neither by the more probable opinion, but

This proved to be the doctrine of the Roman Church. *Cassand. Consult. art. 24.*

*Arnauld, de freq. Comm. prefat. Sect. 2.*

*Part. 3. c. 7. p. 554.*



only that at that time they should be free from the guilt of mortal sin. It is not to be denied, that *Mons. Arnauld* hath proved sufficiently the other opinion to be most consonant to *Scripture* and *Fathers*, and the *rules* of a *Christian life*; but when that is granted, the other opinion is yet more agreeable to the doctrine of the *Roman Church*. For although *Cassander* produce some particular testimonies against it, of persons in that *Church*; yet we must appeal for the sense of their *Church*, to the decrees of the *Council of Trent*; which are so contrived, as not to condemn the grossest doctrine of the *opus operatum*. For when it doth determine, *That whosoever shall say, that the Sacraments do not confer grace ex opere operato shall be Anathema*, it cannot be interpreted, according to the sense of *Cassander* and those he mentions, that the efficacy of *Sacraments* doth not depend upon the *worth of the Priest*: For the *twelfth Canon* relates to that, *Whosoever shall say, that the Minister being in mortal sin, although he useth all the essentials to a Sacrament, yet doth not celebrate a Sacrament, let him be Anathema*. Those Reverend Fathers were not sure so prodigal of their *Anathema's*, to bestow two of them upon the same thing: Their meaning then in the *eighth Canon*, must be distinct from the *twelfth*; and if it be so, the *opus operatum* cannot have respect to the *worth of the Priest*, but the *devotion* of the receiver, and it is there opposed to the faith of the divine promise. This will appear more plain by the account given of it in the *History of that Council*

Council "After, they treated of condemn-  
 "ing those, who deny *Sacraments* do confer  
 "grace to him that putteth not a bar, or do  
 "not confess, that *Grace* is contained in the Sa-  
 "craments, and conferred, not by vertue of  
 "faith, but *ex opere operato* ; but coming to  
 "expound how it is contained, and their  
 "causality, every one did agree, that grace is  
 "gained by all those actions that excite de-  
 "votion, which proceedeth not from the force  
 "of the work it self, but from the vertue  
 "of devotion, which is in the worker, and  
 "these are said in the Schools to cause grace  
 "*ex opere operantis*. There are other actions  
 "which cause grace, not by the devotion of  
 "him that worketh, or him that receiveth the  
 "work, but by vertue of the work it self ; such  
 "are the Christian *Sacraments*, by which grace  
 "is received, so that there be no bar of  
 "mortal sin to exclude it, though there be  
 "not any devotion : So by the work of  
 "Baptism, grace is given to the Infant, whose  
 "mind is not moved towards it, and to one  
 "born a Fool, because there is no impediment  
 "of sin. The *Sacrament* of *Chrism* doth the  
 "like, and that of *extream Unction*, though the  
 "sick man hath lost his memory. But he that  
 "hath mortal sin, and doth persevere actu-  
 "ally or habitually, cannot receive grace by  
 "reason of that contrariety ; not because the  
 "*Sacrament* hath not vertue to produce it  
 "*ex opere operato*, but because the receiver  
 "is not capable, being possessed with a con-  
 "trary quality. I dare now appeal to the

The Hillo-  
 ry of the  
 Council of  
*Trent*, l. 1.  
 p. 237.

most indifferent Judge, Whether what I objected to them concerning the efficacy of *Sacraments*, whether the minds of the receivers of them be prepared or no, were not so far from being a *calumny*, that there is not so much as the least *mistake* in it : if the doctrine of the *Council of Trent* be embraced by them. And any one who shall consider their number of *Sacraments*, and the admirable effects of every one of them, may very well wonder how any man among them should either want *Grace*, or have any *Devotion* ? For *Grace* being conferred by the *Sacraments*, at so many convenient seasons of his life, whether he hath any devotion or no, he is sure of *Grace*, if he doth but partake of their *Sacraments*, and need not trouble himself much about *devotion*, since his work may be done without it. Never certainly any doctrine was better contrived for the satisfaction and encouragement of *impenitent sinners*, than theirs is. Our *Saviour* seems very churlish and severe, when he calls *sinners* to *repentance* that they may be saved ; but they have found out a much easier and smoother passage, like that of a man in a Boat, that they sleep all the while, and land safe at last. Not so much as the use of reason is required for the effect of that blessed *Sacrament* of extream *Unction*, by which like a *Ship* for a long Voyage, a person is pitched and calked for Eternity. Surely, it is the hardest thing that may be, for any one to want *Grace* among them, if they do but suffer the *Use* of *Sacraments* upon them ; and they

are the gentlest givers of it imaginable, for all they desire of their *Penitents* for *Grace*, is only for them to lye still ; but if they should chance to be unruly, and kick away the *Priests*, or their rites of *Chrism*s, I know not then what may become of them. Yet the *Church* of *Rome* hath been so indulgent in this case, that sup-  
 posing men under a delirium, or wholly insensible ; if before, it be but probable they desired it, or gave any signs of contrition, it ought not to be omitted ; always provided, that those who are mad do nothing against the reverence of the *Sacrament* ; and if they do, surely no man in his right wits can think they shall be damned for it. That being secured, their work is done ; and if any sins have remained upon them ; they are taken off by virtue of this *sacred Unction* ; and being thus anointed like the *Athletes* of old they prepared to wrestle with all the powers of Air, who can then fasten no hold upon them. Yet to be just to them, the *Roman Ritual* saith, that *impenitent persons, and those who dye in mortal sin, and excommunicate, and unbaptized, are to be denied extream Unction*. A hard case for those who dye in mortal sin ! for if they could but express any sign of contrition, by the motion of an Eye or a Finger, all were well enough ? And for the *impenitent*, we are not to imagine them so cruel to account any so, but such who refuse the *Sacrament* of *Penance*. The sum of it then is, if a man when he is like to live and therefore to sin no longer, doth but probably express some signs of contrition, and doth not refuse the *Sacrament* of *Penance*, if time and the condition

*Rituale Roman. de Sacram. ext. Unct. Liber. Paris. 1665.*

of the *Patient* permit the using it, then he is to have grace conferred on him by this last *Sacrament* which he is sure to receive, although he be no more sensible what they are doing about him, than if he were dead already. So that upon the whole matter, I begin to wonder how any sort of men in the *Church of Rome* can be afraid of falling so low as *Purgatory*: I had thought so much *Grace* as is given them by every *Sacrament* (where there are so many, and some of them so often used) might have served to carry one to Heaven; they receive a stock of *Grace* in *Baptism*, before they could think of it, if they lose any in Childhood, that is supplied again by the *Sacrament of Chrism* or *Confirmation*; if they fall into actual sins, and so lose it, it is but confessing to the *Priest* and receiving *absolution*; and they set up again with a new stock: and it is a hard case, if that be not increased by frequent *Masses*, at every one of which he receives more; and although *Priests* want the comfortable *Grace* that is to be received by the *Sacrament of Matrimony*, yet they may easily make it up by the number of *Masses*: and to make all sure at last, the extream *Unction* very sweetly conveys *Grace* into them, whether they be sensible or not. But all this while, what becomes of *Purgatory*? That is like to be left very desolate; if the interest of that opinion were not greater, than the evidence is for the *Sacraments* conferring grace *ex opere operato*. Let them seek to reconcile them, if they can; it is sufficient for our purpose, that both of them tend

to destroy the sincerity of devotion, and the necessity of a good life.

§. 8. 3 I said the sincerity of devotion is much obstructed by discouraging the reading of the *Scriptures*, which is our most certain rule of faith and life. To this he answers two ways: 1. That their Churches prudential dispensing the reading the *Scriptures* to persons whom she judges fit and disposed for it, and not to such whom she judges in a condition to receive or do harm by it, is no discouraging the reading of them; any more than a Father may be said to discourage his Child, because he will not put a Knife or a Sword into his hands, when he foresees he will do mischief with it to himself or others; and the *Scriptures*, he saith, are no other, in the hands of one who doth not submit his judgement, in the interpretation of it, to that of the Church; the doing of which he makes the character of a meek and humble soul, and the contrary of an arrogant and presumptuous spirit. 2. That the ill consequences of permitting the promiscuous reading of *Scripture* were complained of by Henry the eighth, who was the first that gave way to it; and if his judgement ought not to be followed in after times, let the dire effects of so many Sects and Fanaticisms as have risen in England from the reading of it, bear witness. For all Heresies arise, saith S. Austin, from misunderstanding the *Scriptures*; and therefore the *Scripture* being left, as among Protestants, to the private interpretation of every fanciful spirit, cannot be a most certain rule of faith and life. In which Answer are three things to be discussed:

Of their discouraging the reading the *Scriptures*.



## 188 Of the hindrance of a good Life, and

1. Whether that prudential dispensing the *Scriptures*, as he calls it, be any hindrance to devotion or no? 2. Whether the reading of the *Scriptures* be the cause of the numbers of *Sells* and *Fanaticisms* which have been in *England*? 3. Whether our opinion concerning the reading and interpreting *Scripture*, doth hinder it from being a most certain rule of faith and life?

1. Whether that prudential dispensing the *Scriptures* used in the *Church* of *Rome*, doth hinder devotion or no? By this prudential dispensing I suppose he means, the allowing no persons to read the *Scriptures* in their own tongue, without licence under the hand of the *Bishop* or *Inquisitor*, by the advice of the *Priest* or *Confessor*, concerning the persons fitness for it; and whosoever presumes to do otherwise, is to be denyed *Absolutum*. For this is the express Command, in the fourth Rule of the *Index* published by order of the *Council of Trent*, and set forth by the authority of *Pius* the fourth, and since by *Clement* the eighth, and now lately enlarged by *Alexander* the seventh. And whether this tends to the promoting or discouraging the sincerity of devotion will appear, by considering these things.

*Index libror. prohib. Alex- and. 7. Rona. A. D. 1665.*

1. That it is agreed on both sides, that the *Scriptures* do contain in them the unquestionable Will of that *God* whom we are bound to serve. And it being the end of devotion (as it ought to be of our lives) to serve him; what is there, the mind of any one who sincerely desires to do it, can be more inquisitive after,

or

or desirous to be satisfied in, than the rules *God* himself hath given for his own service ? Because it is so easie a matter for men to mistake in the wayes they choose to serve him in; I see the world divided scarce more about any thing than this. Some think, *God* ought to be worshipped by offering up Sacrifices to him of those things we receive from his bounty : Others, that we ought to offer up none to him now, but our selves in a holy life and actions. Some, that *God* is pleased by abstaining from flesh or any living creature ; and others , that he is much better pleased with eating *Fish* than *Flesh* , and that a full meal of one is at some times mortification and fasting ; and eating temperately of the other, is luxury and irreligion. Some think, no sight more pleasing to *God* , than to see men lash and whip themselves for their sins, till the blood comes; others that he is as well pleased at least, with hearty repentance, and sincere obedience without this. Some, that frequent crossing themselves , going in Pilgrimage to the *Images of Saints*, baptizing Bells, being sprinckled with holy water, and buried in a *Monks* habit, are great acts of devotion ; and others, that they are superstitious fooleries. Some think, that unless they make confession of their sins to a *Priest*, they cannot be pardoned ; others, that sincere confession to *God*, is sufficient, and the other never necessary to the pardon of sin, though it may be sometimes useful to the ease of the sinner. Some, that they honour *God* by setting up Images of him, and worshipping them for his sake ;

sake ; by addressing themselves to Saints and Angels to be Intercessors with him ; and others, that they cannot dishonour *God* more, than by these things. Some, that they may pray for what they do not understand, as well as what they do ; others, that since men expect to be answered in their prayers, they ought to understand what they say in them. Since these and other disputes are in the world, not barely between *Christians* and those of other *Religions*, but among *Christians* themselves, what course should a person take, who desires to be satisfied ? For he finds the several parties divided about them. Can any man imagine a better way, if it could be hoped for, than that *God* himself should interpose, and declare his own mind according to what way they ought to serve him ? And this is acknowledged by all *Christians* to be done already, in the *Scriptures* ; and after all this, must not all persons concerned, be allowed to enquire into that which is owned to be the will of *God* ? Or do they think, that ordinary people, that understand not *Latin* or *Greek*, ought not to be concerned what becomes of their souls ? If they be, and do in good earnest desire to know how to please *God*, and to serve him ; what directions will they give them ? If they tell them, *they must do as they are bidden* ; true, say they, if we were to worship you for *Gods*, we would do as you bid us, for we think it fitting to serve *God* in his own way. But we would know, whether that *God* whom we serve, hath given us any

rules

rules for his worship or no? Yes, say the Priests of the *Roman Church*, he hath done so, but it is not fit for you to see them. To what end, say the people then, were they given, if they may not be seen? How shall we know, whether we keep them or no; or will you take upon you the guilt of our sins in disobeying his Will, since you will not let us know what it is? This seems to be a very just and reasonable demand, and I fear it will one day fall heavy upon those, who conceal that, which they confess to be the *Will of God*, from the knowledge of the people. And it hath been ingenuously acknowledged by some in the *Roman Church*, that the people would never be kept to that way of devotion they are in there, if they were suffered to read the *Scriptures*; but the more shame, the mean time, for those who impose such things upon them, under a pretence of devotion, which are so repugnant to the Will of God. But the same reason which hath made them leave out the *second Commandment* in their offices of devotion, hath brought them to so severe a prohibition of reading the *Scriptures* in a known language, but where themselves are already so secure of the persons that they dare to give way to it: and that is, lest their consciences should start and boggle at the breaking a command of *God*, when they pretended to serve him.

The argu-  
ments  
against  
reading the  
Scriptures,  
would  
have held  
against the  
publishing  
them in a  
language  
known to  
the People.

§. 9. 2. That no objection can be now made against the peoples reading the *Scriptures*, but would have held against the publishing them in a language to be understood by the people. For were the people less ignorant and heady, less presumptuous and opinionative then, than they are now? Was not there the same danger of mistaking their sense at that time? Was not the people of *Israel* as refractory and disobedient, as any have been since? Were they not as apt to quarrel with divine *Laws*, and the authority *God* had set up among them? Did not they fall into *Sects* and divers opinions, by misunderstanding the *Law*? yet were these reasons then thought sufficient for *God* not to make known his *Law* to all the people; but to commit it only to *Aaron* and the *Priests*, for them prudentially to dispense it to them? No; so far from it, that strict care was taken to make the people understand it; particular commands given, for this very end; and the *Law* on purpose declared to be easie and intelligible, that they might not make its obscurity a pretence for their Ignorance. Was not this *Law* given them, as a rule to direct themselves by? Were not all sent to this to learn to govern their actions? *Wherewithall shall a young man cleanse his ways, by taking heed thereto according to thy word?* Is not this *Law* said to convert the soul, and to make wise the simple? and was that done by not understanding it? Was it not the delight, exercise, and continual Meditation of those who were truly devout among them? But how comes our case to

Psal. 119. 9.

Psal. 19. 7.

be so much worse under *Christianity*? Is the *Law* of *Christ* so much more difficult and obscure, than the *Law* of *Moses*? Is not his *Sermon* on the *Mount*, wherein he delivers the rules of a *Christian Life*, as plain as any Chapter in *Leviticus*? What doth the *Gospel* teach men, but to be and to do good, to love all men, and to love *God* above all, to believe in *Christ* and to obey his commands, to repent of sins past and to live no longer in them; and in short, so to live in this world, as they hope to live with *God* in happiness hereafter? And are these things so hard to be understood, that the people ought not to be made acquainted with them, in their own language? Or is there any danger, they should know them too well? Was ever the *Law* of *Moses* more perverted by false interpretations, than in our *Saviours* time by the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*? Why doth not he then take some other care for his own *Law* to prevent this for the future, if that had been judged by him the proper way of cure? But thereby we see the mistakes of the people are owing to their Teachers, and there can be no means to prevent errors in the people, but by stopping them at the fountain heads, from whence they run down among them. For the common people might have had a better notion of *Religion*, if their minds had not been corrupted by the traditions and *Glosses* of the *Pharisees*. Therefore methinks, they have not gone the wisest way to work in the *Church* of *Rome*; instead of this *prudential dispensing* the *Scriptures*, their only way had been to have destroyed



destroyed them, as *Dioclesian*, their predeceffour in this kind of *prudence*, once designed. For let them assure themselves, they who understand *Greek* and *Latin* are the persons they have ten times more cause to fear, than the common people. And considering the advantage they once had by the horrible *Ignorance* of *Priests* and people, it must be imputed only to the watchful eye of Divine Providence, that the *Scriptures* (being of so little use in the *Roman Church*) have been preserved entire to our dayes. There had been no such means in the world to have prevented a *Reformation*, as this; for they are not out, when they take the *Scripture* so much for their enemy, as appears by the force and restraint they put upon it, and the fear and jealousy they are in about it continually. If it had not been for this, would any one have compared the *Scriptures*, in the hands of the common people as my Adversary doth, to a *Sword in a mad mans hand*? Is it of so destructive a Nature, and framed for no other use than a sword is? which nothing but discretion keeps a man from doing mischief by; and all the way a man hath (though never so meek and humble) to defend himself by it, is by destroying his enemy with it, if he continues his assault. These expressions do not argue any kindness to the *Scripture*, nor an apprehension of any great good that comes to the world by it; but that really men might have been more at ease and fewer differences in Religion had happened, if all the Copies of the *Bible* had been lost, as soon as the *Pope* had placed himself in his infallible *Chair*.

This

This design was once attempted, as I shall shew afterwards, but failed of success: and I know not how far the principles of this *prudence* may carry them, if ever such a season should fall into their hands again; having found so much trouble to them from the *Scriptures* and so little benefit by them, their *Church* being once owned as *infallible*. For I would fain know, whether the *Scripture* hath not done more mischief, according to them, in the hands of the *Reformers*, than it can be supposed to do in the hands of the *common people*. If it must be a *sword in a mad mans hand*, whether the more strength and cunning such a one hath, he be not capable of doing so much the more mischief by it? And if it were possible to get it out of such a mans hands, whether it were not the highest *prudence*, and care of the publick safety to do it? It can be then nothing but the impossibility of the thing, which makes them suffer the *Scripture* to be in the hands of any who are capable of doing mischief by it; and the more mischief they may do, the more desirable and *prudential* it is to take it from them. But all men see none are so capable of doing mischief thereby, as men of the greatest wit and learning, and that have the fairest appearance of *piety* to the world: the consequence then of this doctrine is, if pursued to the true design of it, that the *Scripture* should be kept if possible out of the hands of the most subtle, learned and pious men above all others, if they be not true to the interests of the *Roman Church*? It is but a meer shew to pretend only to keep the people in order,

order, ( for when are they otherwise, but when cunning men have, the managing of them ? ) the true meaning of this principle is, that it will never be well with the World till the Books of *Scripture* are all burnt, which are abroad ; and that only one *Original* be preserved in the *Vatican* to justify the *Popes* title to *Infalibility*, and that ( as the *Sybilline Oracles* of old, ) never to be consulted but in cases of great extremity ; and that under the inspection of some very trusty officers ; nor to be interpreted but by the *Pope* himself. If I were of the Church of *Rome*, and owned the principles of it, I must needs have condemned the great men of it in former times, for want of *Prudence* in this matter : That would have served their turn much better than forging so many *decretal Epistles*, falsifying so many *testimonies*, perverting so many *Texts* of *Scripture* to maintain the dignity of the *Papal Chair*. There was only one small circumstance wanting, ( their good will we have no cause to question ) and that was the possibility of it ; for although the *Roman Church* called it self *Catholick*, they were wise enough to know, there were many considerable *Churches* in the world besides theirs, where the *Scriptures* were preserved, and from whence Copies might be procured by persons who would be so much the more inquisitive, the more they were forbidden to get them. Therefore they pitched upon an easier way, and finding the people under a very competent degree of *Ignorance*, they indulged them and soothed them

up

up in it, and told them they could never miss the way to Heaven, though never so narrow, in the dark. Their only danger was too much light; for then probably they might be in a great dispute, whether the *broad way* was not the true; for there they saw most of their *Friends and Leaders*. And while they kept the people in this profound Ignorance and superstition, they jogged on in their opinion, as securely to Heaven, as *Ignatius Loyola's* Mule did to *Mount-serrat*, when he laid his Bridle on his neck, to see whether he would take the way to pursue the *Moor*, which was the more beaten track, or the more craggy and untrodden way to that place of devotion; and by a mighty providence, (and I suppose a little help of the Rider) the Beast took the more narrow way. But when persons began to be awakened by learning, and thereby grew inquisitive into all matters, and so by degrees in those of Religion; they then espied their error, in letting such a Book lye abroad in so many hands, from whence so many irresistible arguments were drawn against the Doctrine and practices of the *Roman Church*. This I assure my self, is the true ground of the quarrels against the Reading of the *Scriptures*, but that being now irremediable, they betake themselves to smaller arts, and endeavour to hinder any one particular person, whom they have the least suspicion of, from meddling with a Book so dangerous to their *Church and Religion*.

*Orlandin.*  
*hist. Societ.*  
*Jesu l. 1.*  
*n. 17.*  
*Maffei*  
*vit. Ignat.*  
*l. 1, c. 3.*

The practice of the Roman Church herein directly contrary to that of the Primitive Church.

§. 10. For if this were not it, what makes them to be more jealous of, the *use* of the *Scriptures*, than ever the Christians were in former Ages? Was there not much more danger of misunderstanding the Doctrine of the Gospel at first, than ever after? Nay were there not very many who were false *Apostles*, and great and dangerous Hereticks, presumptuous and arrogant, if ever any were? But did *Christ*, or his *Apostles*, for all this, think it unfit to communicate the doctrine of the Gospel to the people; or were the Books containing it written in Languages not to be understood by them? no they chose the most popular Languages of that time, most largely spread and generally understood. The *Apostles* never told their Disciples, of the danger of reading the Divine Writings that were among them, when they were first spread abroad; and never so proper a season to give them caution, as then. But instead of that, they advise them to take heed to the sure word of Prophecy, and tell them that they did well therein, that the *Scriptures* were written for their instruction and comfort, that being divinely inspired they were able to make them wise unto salvation. What, did the *Apostles* never imagine all this while, the ill use that might be made of them by men of perverse minds? yes, they knew it as well as any, and did foretell *Schisms* and *Heresies* that should be in the Church, and saw them in their own dayes; and yet, poor men, wanted that exquisite prudence of the Roman Church, to prevent them, by so happy an expedient, as when they

2 Pet. 1. 19.

Rom. 15. 4.

2 Tim. 3.

15, 16.

they had written *Epistles* to several Churches to forbid the promiscuous reading of them. But it may be, it was the awe of the *Apostles* and their infallible *Spirit* in interpreting *Scripture*, made this prohibition not so necessary in their own time; did the Church then find it necessary to restrain the people, after their Decease? We have an occasion soon after given, wherein to see the opinion of the Church at that time; the Church of *Corinth* fell into a grievous Schism and opposition, to their spiritual Governours: upon this *Clement* writes his *Epistle* to them; wherein he is so far from forbidding the use of *Scripture* to them to preserve unity, that he bids them look diligently into the *Scriptures*, which are the true Oracles of the Holy Ghost: and afterwards, take *St. Pauls Epistle* into your hands, and consider what he saith; and he commends them very much for being skilled in the *Scriptures*: Beloved, saith he, ye have known, and very well known, the holy *Scriptures*; and ye have thoroughly looked into the Oracles of God, therefore call them to mind. Which language is as far different from that of the *Roman Church*, as the Church of that Age is from theirs. Nay the counterfeit *Clement* (whom they can make use of, upon other occasions) is as express in this matter, as the true. For he perswades private Christians to continual meditation in the *Scriptures*, which he calls the Oracles of Christ; and that this is the best employment of their retirements. But we need not use his testimony in this matter, nor the old Edition of *Ignatius*, wherein Parents are bid to instruct their Children

*Clement.  
Epistol. ad  
Corinth.  
p. 58.  
P. 61.*

*P. 68.*

*Constit. Clement. l. 1.  
c. 4.*



*Ignat. ep. ad  
Philadelph.  
Polycarp.  
Ep. ad Ph-  
lipp. p. 16.  
ed usser.*

*Clem. Alex-  
andr. Strom.  
7. p 728.  
Tertul. de  
anim. c. 9.  
Origen.  
Comment. in  
Matthæum.  
p. 220.*

*Comment. in  
Jos. p. 27.*

*Homil. in  
Levit. 9.*

in the Holy Scriptures ; nor that saying of Poly-  
carp to the Philippians out of the old Latin Edi-  
tion, I am confident you are well studied in the  
Scriptures ; for in the Greek yet preserved, he  
exhorts them to the reading of St. Pauls Epistles,  
that they might be built up in the faith. So little  
did these holy men dream of such a prudent  
dispensing the Scriptures among them, for fear of  
mischief they might do themselves or others  
by them. Clemens Alexandrinus mentions the  
reading the Scriptures among Christians before  
their Meals, and Psalms and Hymns at them ;  
and Tertullian mentions the same custome.  
Origen, in the Greek Commentaries, lately  
published, perswades Christians by all means,  
by attending to Reading, Prayer, Teaching, Me-  
ditation therein day and night, to lay up in  
their hearts not only the new Oracles of the Go-  
spel, Apostles and Apocalypse, but the old ones too  
of the Law and the Prophets. And elsewhere  
tells his hearers, they ought not to be discouraged  
if they met with difficulties in reading the Scri-  
ptures ; for there was great benefit to be had  
by them. But lest it should be thought, he  
speaks here only of publick reading the Scri-  
ptures, in his Homilies on Leviticus he speaks  
plainly, that he would not only have them hear the  
Word of God in publick, but to be exercised and  
meditate therein in their houses night and day ;  
For Christ is every where present, and therefore  
they are commanded in the Law, to meditate  
therein upon their journeys, and when they sit in  
their houses, and when they lye down and rise up.  
But had not the Church yet experience enough  
of

of the mischief of permitting the *Scriptures* to the people? Were there ever greater and more notorious heresies than in those first ages of the *Church*, and those arising from perverting the words and design of the *Scriptures*? But did the *Church* yet afterwards grow wiser, in the sense of the *Roman Church*? In the time of the four *General Councils* they had tryal enough of the mischief of *Heresies*, but did the *Fathers* of the *Church* forbid the reading the *Scriptures*, on that account? No, but instead of that, they commend the *Scriptures* to all, as the best remedy for all passions of the mind; so St. Basil, and St. Hierome call it; and this latter commends nothing more to the Women he instructed in devotion, than constant reading the *Scriptures*; and withal they say that infinite evils do arise from ignorance of the *Scriptures*; from hence most part of *Heresies* have come, from hence a negligence and careless life, and unfruitful labours. Nay so frequent, so earnest and vehement is St. Chrysostome in this matter of recommending the reading of *Scriptures*, that those of the *Roman Church* have no other way to answer him, but by saying he speaks hyperbolically; which in plain English is, he speaks too much of it. But how far different were the opinions of the wise men of the *Church* in those times, from what those have thought who understood the interest of the *Roman Church* best? We may see what the opinion of the latter is, by the counsel given to Julius 3. by the *Bishops* met at *Bononia* for that end, to give the best advice they could for

Basil. in  
Psal. 1.  
Hieron. praefat. com. in  
ep. ad Ephes.

S. Chrys.  
praefat. in  
Epist. ad  
Rom.

Consil. de  
stabilizandâ  
Rom. sede.  
p. 6.

restoring the dignity of the *Roman See*; that which was the greatest and weightiest of all, they said, they reserved to the last; which was, that by all means as little of the Gospel as might be especially in the vulgar tongue, be read in the Cities under his jurisdiction; and that little which was in the Mass ought to be sufficient; neither should it be permitted to any mortal to read more. For as long as men were contented with that little, all things went well with them, but quite otherwise since more was commonly read. For this, in short, is that Book, say they, which above all others hath raised those Tempests and Whirlwinds, which we are almost carryed away with: And in truth, if any one diligently considers it, and compares it with what is done in our Churches, will find them very contrary to each other; and our very doctrine not only to be different from it, but repugnant to it. A very fair and ingenuous confession! and if self-condemned persons be Hereticks, there can be none greater than those of the *Roman Church*; especially the prudential men in it, such as these certainly were, whom the Pope singled out to give advice in these matters. But how different is the wisdom of the Children of this world from that of the Children of Light! We have already seen what other kind of judgement the ancient Fathers had of the usefulness of *Scriptures* to the people, than they have in the *Roman Church*: but we need not more to prove it, since it is acknowledged by those who are against the reading the *Scriptures* by the people, that it was otherwise in the *Primitive Church*; so

*Alphonsus*

*Alphonſus à Caſtro* and *Sixtus Senenſis* confeſs. *Alphonſ à Caſtro ad- verſ. herie. l. 1. c. 13.*  
*Eſpenceus* quotes many plain places from *St. Au- ſtin*, and *St. Chryſoſtom* to prove, that the people ought to be very diligent in reading the *Scriptures* in their own houſes, and that nothing ſhould excuſe them from it: and confeſſeth that *St. Pauls* precept, *Col. 3. Let the Word of God dwell richly in you* was intended for the people; and that they ought to have it among them, not only ſufficiently, but abundantly. The ſum of this argument is, that the reaſons now urged againſt the peoples Reading the *Scriptures* would have held againſt the publiſhing of them in a language to be underſtood by the people; that they ſaw the ſame inconveniencies which are objected now, and yet commended the reading the *Scriptures* to all; that in all the primitive *Church*, the practice was not only retained, but vehemently urged, after all the Hereſies which had riſen in the *Church* in their time; and therefore for the *Church* of *Rome* to account it wiſdom to keep the people from it, is to charge not only the *Fathers* of the *Church* with folly, but the *Apoſtles*, and our *Saviour*, and *God* himſelf.

## CHAP. IV.

*Of the Fanaticism of the Roman Church.*

*The unreasonableness of objecting Sects and Fanaticisms to us, as the effects of reading the Scriptures. Fanaticism countenanced in the Roman Church, but condemned by ours. Private revelations made among them the grounds of believing some points of doctrine; proved from their own Authors. Of the Revelations pleaded for the immaculate Conception. The Revelations of S. Brigitt and S. Catharin directly contrary in this point, yet both owned in the Church of Rome. The large approbations of S. Brigitts, by Popes and Councils; and both their revelations acknowledged to be divine, in the lessons read upon their dayes. S. Catharines wonderful faculty of smelling souls, a gift peculiar to her and Philip Neri. The vain attempts of reconciling those Revelations. The great number of female Revelations approved in the Roman Church. Purgatory, Transubstantiation, Auricular Confession proved by Visions and Revelations. Festivals appointed upon the credit of Revelations: the Feast of Corpus Christi on the Revelation made to Juliana, the Story of it related from their own Writers: No such thing can be objected to our Church. Revelations still owned by*

by them ; proved from the Fanatick Revelations of Mother Juliana very lately published by Mr. Cressy : Some instances of the blasphemous Non-sense contained in them. The Monastick Orders founded in Enthusiasm. An account of the great Fanaticism of S. Benedict, and S. Romoaldus: their hatred of Humane Learning, and strange Visions and Revelations. The Carthusian Order founded upon a Vision. The Carmelites Vision of their habit. The Franciscan and Dominican Orders founded on Fanaticism, and seen in a Vision of Innocent the third to be the great supporters of the Roman Church. The Quakerism of S. Francis described from their best Authors. His Ignorance, Extasies and Fanatick Preaching. The Vision of Dominicus. The blasphemous Enthusiasm of the Mendicant Fryers. The History of it related at large. Of the Evangelium æternum, and the blasphemies contained in it. The Author of it supposed to be the General of the Franciscan Order, however owned by the Fryers, and read and preached at Paris. The opposition to it by the University : but favoured by the Popes. Gul. S. Armour writing against it, his Book publicly burnt, by order of the Court of Rome. The Popes horrible partiality to the Fryers. The Fanaticism of the Franciscans afterwards. Of the followers of Petrus Johannis de Oliva. The Spiritual State began (say they) from St. Francis. The story of his wounds, and Maria Visitationis parallel'd. The canting language used by the spiritual Brethren, called Beguini,



Beguini, Fraticelli, and Begardi. Of their doctrines about Poverty, Swearing Perfection, the Carnal Church and Inspiration: by all which, they appear to be a Sect of Quakers, after the Order of S. Francis. Of the Schism made by them. The large spreading, and long continuance of them. Of the Apostolici and Dulcinista. Of their numerous Conventicles. Their high opinion of themselves. Their zeal against the Clergie, and Tythes; their doctrine of Christian Liberty. Of the Alumbrado's in Spain: their disobedience to Bishops; obstinate adhering to their own fancies, calling them Inspirations, their being above Ordinances. Ignatius Loyola suspected to be one of the Illuminati, proved from Melchior Canus. The Jesuits Order founded in Fanaticism; a particular account of the Romantick Enthusiasm of Ignatius from the Writers of his own Order. Whereby it is proved, that he was the greatest pretender to Enthusiasm, since the dayes of Mahomet and S. Francis. Ignatius gave no respect to men by words, or putting off his Hat; his great Ignorance and Preaching in the Streets: his glorying in his sufferings for it; his pretence to Mortification; the wayes he used to get Disciples. Their way of resolution of difficulties by seeking God; their itinerant preaching in the Cities of Italy. The Sect of Quakers a new Order of Disciples of Ignatius, only wanting Confirmation from the Pope, which Ignatius obtained. Of the Fanatick way of devotion in the Roman Church. Of Superstitions and

Enthusiastical Fanaticisms among them. Of their mystical Divinity. Mr. Cressy's canting in his Preface to Sancta Sophia. Of the Deiform fund of the soul; a superessential life, and the way to it. Of contemplating with the will. Of passive Unions. The method of Self-annihilation. Of the Union of nothing with nothing. Of the feeling of not-being. The mischief of an unintelligible way of devotion. The utmost effects of this way is gross Enthusiasm. Mr. Cressy's Vindication of it examined. The last sort of Fanaticism among them, resisting authority under pretence of Religion. Their principles and practices compared with the Fanaticks. How far they are disowned at present by them. Of the Vindication of the Irish Remonstrance. The Court of Rome hath always favoured that party, which is most destructive to Civil Government, proved by particular and late Instances.

§. 1. 2. **W**E come to consider, Whether the reading the Scriptures be the cause of all the Sects and Fanaticisms which have been in England? He might much better have charged the Philosophers, especially Aristotle, with all the disputes in the world; for they not only by their writings have occasioned many, but have taught men the pernicious use of reasoning, without which, the world might be as quiet as a Flock of Sheep. If they could but perswade men to lay aside that mischievous faculty, I dare undertake for them, that let the people have the Bible never

The unreasonable-  
ness of  
objecting  
Sects and  
Fanaticism  
to us, as  
the effect  
of reading  
the Scrip-  
tures.

so much among them, they shall never hurt the Church of Rome. Do they not tell us, that the words of Scripture are plain for Transubstantiation, (*This is my Body.*) Why do not then the people as readily believe that, as any other proposition? By which we see, it is not merely reading, but a more dangerous thing, called *considering* or *reasoning*, which makes them embrace some things as they lie in words, and interpret others according to the clearest evidence, which the nature of the thing, the comparing with other places, and the common sense of mankind will give. *But why are we not all of a mind?* I would fain know the time when men were so. This variety of *Seſts* was objected against the *Philosophers*, and thought no Argument then; it was objected against the *primitive Christians*, and thought of no force then; why must it signifie more in *England*, than ever it did in any other age or place? But say they, *It was otherwise in England, before the Scriptures came to be read by all; it was, and is, otherwise in all Churches where they are not read: therefore these Seſts and Fanaticisms are the dire effects of the promiscuous reading the Scriptures.* This is the common and popular Argument. *All things were well with us when we offered up Cakes to the Queen of Heaven; when all joyned in the communion of the Roman Church, then there were no Fanaticisms, nor New Lights, no Seſts as there are now in England: therefore why should any one make any doubt, but he ought to return to the Church of Rome?* This necessarily leads me into the

the examination of these two things. 1. Whether there be no danger of *Fanaticism* in the *Roman Church*? 2. Whether the *Unity* of that *Church* be so admirable to tempt all persons, who prize the *Churches Unity*, to return to it?

§. 2. Concerning the danger of *Fanaticism* in the *Roman Church*. By *Fanaticism* we understand, either an *Enthusiastick way of Religion*; or resisting authority, under a pretence of *Religion*. In either sense it shall appear, that the *Church of Rome* is so far from being cleared from it, that it hath given great encouragement to it.

*Fanaticism*  
countenanced in  
the *Roman Church*.

1. As to an *Enthusiastick way of Religion*: I shall now prove, that there have not been greater *Enthusiasts* among us in *England*, than have been in the *Roman Church*; all the difference is, they have been some always, others for a time, allowed, and countenanced, and encouraged by those of the *Church of Rome*; but among us they have been decryed and opposed, by all the members of the *Church of England*. I shall not insist upon their resolution of faith, and the infallibility of their *Church*, which must be carried to *Enthusiasm* at last; but I shall prove it by plain *Revelations*, which have been made the grounds among them of believing some doctrines in dispute, and the reasons of setting up a more perfect way of life, which in the highest strain of their *Devotion*, is meer *Enthusiasm*.

Private  
Revelati-  
ons plead-  
ed for  
matters of  
doctrine.

Lucas Wad-  
dingus Le-  
gutien. de  
concept.  
Virg. Ma-  
rie. prefat.

Seft. 3.  
Traft. II.  
Seft. 1. n. 3.  
Baron. not.  
in Martyro-  
log. Rom.  
8 Decem.

1. *Revelations* have been pleaded by them in matters of doctrine; such I mean which depend upon immediate impulses and inspirations, since the *Canon of Scripture* and *Apostolical Traditions*. Of this we have a remarkable instance, in a late Controversie managed with great heat and interest on both sides, viz. of the *immaculate conceptions* of the *Virgin Mary*: about the ending of which, a solemn *Embassy* was sent from the *Kings of Spain*, *Philip* the third, and *Philip* the fourth, to the *Popes*, *Paul* the fifth, and *Gregory* the thirteenth; and an account is given of it by one, concerned himself in the management of the Theological part of it, which, he saith, is therefore published, that the world may understand upon what grounds the doctrines of faith are established among them. One of the chief whereof insisted upon was, some private revelations, made to some Saints, about the immaculate conception, which being once received in the Church, adds no small strength, he saith, to any doctrine, and gives a solid foundation for a definition: i. e. that the matter may be defined to be of faith, and necessary to be believed by all Christians. Upon this he reckons up several Revelations, publicly received in the Church; one, mentioned by *Anselm*, being a divine apparition to an Abbot in a storm (a fit time for apparitions) whereby he was admonished to keep the Feast of the Conception of the blessed *Virgin*; upon which, as *Baronius* observes, that Feast was first kept in England. Which Revelation, *Wadding* tells us, is publicly recited in the office for the day; and was not only extant in several

*several Breviaries of England, France, Spain and Italy; but he had divers himself authorized by the Pope, wherein it was recommended as true and piously to be believed; and accordingly hath been publickly sung and used in the Church about an hundred years. And what, saith he, is the consequence of disbelieving this, but to say in effect, that the Pope and the Roman Church are easily cheated and abused by Impostures, and Forgers of false Revelations to institute new Festival Solemnities upon the credit of them? Another Revelation was made to Norbertus, the Founder of the Order of the Premonstratenses; in which, the Virgin Mary appeared, and commended her Veneration to him, and gave him a white garment, in token of her Original Innocency; which Revelation is believed by all of that Order, and taken as the reason of their habit. Besides these, there are several other Revelations to S. Gertrude; and others to the same purpose reckoned up by several Catholick Authors, which no man ought to reject, unless he intends to be as great a Heretick (or therein as wise a man) as Erasmus was. Nay, these Revelations were so frequent, he saith, that there hath been no age since the tenth Century, wherein there hath not been some made to devout men or women, about this matter. But above all these, most remarkable were those to S. Brigit; who had not one or two, but many to this purpose: and the latest were of Joanna a Cruce, which, it seems, were at first eagerly opposed, but at last came out with the approbation of two Cardinals, and several Bishops of the Inquisition in Spain. But now who could imagine a thing*



thing so often revealed, so publicly allowed, so many times attested from Heaven, should not be generally received? but the mischief of it was, the contrary doctrine had Revelations for it too. For *Antoninus* and *Cajetan* say, *S. Catharine* of *Siena* had it revealed to her, that she was conceived with Original sin. What is to be done now? Here we have Saint against Saint, Revelation against Revelation, *S. Catharine* against *S. Brigit* and all the rest of them. Here to speak truth, they are somewhat hard put to it; for they grant *God* cannot contradict himself, and therefore one of these must be false, but which of them is all the question. Here they examine, which of these doctrines is most constant to *Scripture* and *Tradition*, which is most for the benefit of the *Church*, which were persons of the greater *Sanctity*, and whose *Revelations* were the most approved. For *S. Brigit*s they plead stoutly, that when they were delivered by her to her Confessors, they were strictly examined and after them by the *Bishops* and *Divines* of *Sueden*, and approved as *Divine Revelations*; from them they were sent as such to the *Council of Basil*; from thence they were examined over again at *Naples*, and there allowed, and preached in the presence, and by command, of the *Queen* and *Archbishop*, before all the people of the City; again examined at *Rome* by *Prelates* and *Cardinals*, *A.D.* 1377. by the *Popes* appointment, and there approved: and *A.D.* 1379. they are declared by those to whom *Urban* the sixth committed the new examination

nation of them, to be authentick, and to have come from the Spirit of God : and so, much is declared by *Boniface* the ninth, in the Bull of her Canonization ; and at last approved, saith *Wadding* , at the General Council of *Basil*. What could be expected less after this ; than that they should have been received as *Canonical Scriptures*, they having never taken so much pains in examining and approving any controverted Books of the Bible, as they had done about these Revelations ? And no man knows how far their authority might have prevailed, if the whole Sect of *Dominicans* had not been engaged in the opposite opinion. For nothing else , that I can find, hath given any discredit to her Revelations but this ; which makes *Cajetan* call them *old Wives dreams*, as *Wadding* confesseth. But it falls out very conveniently, that *S. Catharines* Revelation was just in the *Dominican* way , in which she had been educated ; and for all that I can see, wants little of the reputation of *S. Brigit*. For they were both very wonderful persons, and had more familiar Revelations, than any of the Prophets we read of. *S. Brigit* in her Childhood ( if we believe the account given of her , in the Bull of Canonization by *Bonifacius*, and her life by *Vastavius* ) had Visions as frequently as other Children have *Babies*, and was as well pleased with them ; the *Virgin Mary* was once her *Midwife*, as the *Pope* very gravely tells us ; but her Revelation ( after *Christ* took her for his Spouse ) have filled a great Volume. Wherein a person that hath leisure enough, may see

*Wadding. l. 6. Sect. 24. p. 357.*

*Revelationes S. Brigitte. Antw. 1611.*

*Brev. Rom.*  
*S. Octobr.*  
*p. 1017.*

*Brev. Rom.*  
*Apr. 30.*  
*p. 808.*

strange effects of the power of imagination, or a Religious Melancholy ; and to that Book the Pope in his Bull refers us : and if any thing can be more considerable than the Popes authority, the whole Roman Church in the prayers upon S. Brigits day, do confess these Revelations to have come immediately from God to her ; and in one of the Lessons for that day, do magnifie the multitude of her Divine Revelations. But to say truth, the Church of Rome allows fair play in the case, for it magnifies S. Catharine as much as S. Brigit : for her holy Extasies are mentioned in the Lessons upon her day, in one of which were five rayes, coming from the five wounds of our Saviour to five parts of her body ; and she ( being wonderful humble ) prayed our Lord that the wounds might not appear ( for fear she should have been thought as holy as S. Francis ) and immediately the colour of the blood was changed, into pure light upon her hands, and feet, and heart. And her Confessor Raimund ( who is alwayes a principal man in these things, as Matibias a Suecia was to S. Brigit ) without whom she was advised from Heaven to do nothing, saw these splendid wounds upon her body ; ( but by what instrument did he see the wound in her heart ? ) Well, though we Hereticks are not apt to be too credulous in these cases, the Church of Rome very gravely tells us in the next Lesson, that her learning was not acquired, but infused ; by which she answered the most profound Doctors, in the most difficult speculations in Divinity ; but these were nothing to her Revelations, and the service she did

did the Church of *Rome* by them; in a time of *Schism*. But one gift she had above *S. Brigit*; which was that while she was on earth she could not only see, but smell souls too; and could not endure the stench of wicked souls, as *Raynaldus* tells us from her Confessor *Raimund*: a gift very few had, besides her and *Philip Nerius* the Father of the *Oratorians*; for *Raynaldus* one of his Order; tells us from *Bacius* the Writer of his life, that he was sometimes so offended with the smells of filthy souls, that he would desire the persons to empty the Jakes of their souls. Such divine Noses had these two Saints among them! A degree of *Enthusiasm*, above the Spirit of discerning any *Quakers* among us have ever pretended to. Pope *Pius* the second in the Bull of *Canonization* of *S. Catherine*, not only acknowledgeth a gift of *Prophecy* to have been in her, but that sometimes her *Extasies* were so great; that she was sensible of no kind of pain in them. And *S. Brigit* was often seen much above ground in her devotions; and one saw *Rivers*, and another *Fire* come out of her mouth; but I think not at the same time. These are things we rake not the old Kennels of the *Golden Legends* for, but are at this day allowed and approved of in the *Roman Church*; and their days kept, and they prayed to, upon the account of such things as these are.

§. 3. Yet still we are to seek what is to be done, when two Revelations contradict each other? for the *Dominicans* are as peremptory for the Revelation of *S. Catherine*, as their

*Raynald.*  
*Annals*  
*Ecclesiast.*  
*A.D. 1380.*  
*n. 25.*

*Raynald ib.*

*Exon. Ann.*  
*ales A. D.*  
*1370 n. 20.*

*Revelations*  
*contrary to*  
*each other*  
*approved*  
*by the*  
*Roman*  
*Church*

*Del Rio*  
*disquis.*  
*Mag. l. 4.*  
*c. 1. q. 3.*  
*Sect. 4.*

*Job. Francis.*  
*Picus*  
*Mirand. de*  
*verum præ-*  
*not. l. 9. c. 2.*

*C. 4.*

*Del Rio ib.*

adversaries are for that of S. Brigit. Two bold Fellows called *Henricus de Hassia* and *Sybillanus* knew no other way, but to reject both as *illusions* and *fancies*; but what becomes then of the *Popes* and *Councils* infallibility, who have approved both? *Franciscus Picus Mirandula* being a Learned and Ingenuous man, confesseth himself at a loss; both being concerning a thing passed, there must be truth on one side, and falsehood on the other: for the case is not the same, saith he, as to past and future things, in which a condition may be understood. By which means S. Bernard escaped, when he promised great success to an expedition into the Holy Land, and they who went in it found the quite contrary. But at last he gives us leave to conjecture his meaning, when he saith, *That if any thing be false in a Prophecy, though some prove true, we have cause to suspect all; especially if it come from women, whose judgements are weak, and their passions vehement, and imaginations easily possessed with what they are most desirous of, and least able to distinguish between the strength of imagination, and a divine Revelation: But as to that particular case of S. Catharine and S. Brigit, where both were women; he saith, The Divines were generally for the former, and the Monks for the latter; but which was in the truth, he thinks cannot be known upon earth.*

*Martin Del Rio*, discoursing of the Revelations of Canonized Saints who were women in the Church of Rome, reckons S. Angela a Carmelite, whose Book of Revelations came out

out above four hundred years ago; S. Gertrude, A. D. 664. S. Hildegardis in Germany, A. D. 1180. and about the same time S. Elizabeth of Sconagh, all whose Revelations were published, and the last collected by Roger an English Cistercian; and in latter times he mentions S. Brigit and S. Catharine, whose Revelations, he saith, were opposed by some, but he declares for his part, that he is not at all moved with their arguments, for that would diminish too much the honor due to those holy Spouses of Christ, as he calls them; but in truth he confesses, the honor of their Church is concerned in it; for, saith he, several Popes upon diligent examination have allowed and approved these Revelations, as Eugenius the third did those of Hildegardis, as well as Boniface the ninth, those of S. Brigit. For the Argument from the contradiction of these Revelations, he knows not how to come off, but by a charge of Forgery on the Dominican side; and why might not they as well return it on the other? unless *Matthia a Suetia*, Confessor to S. Brigit, were more infallible than *Raimundus*, or those who believed S. Catharine.

But this is not the only case, wherein these Female Revelations so much approved by the Church of Rome are contradictory to each other, in those things whereon the proof of a point of doctrine depends. For who knows not, to what end the Revelation of S. Gregories delivering the soul of Trajan by his prayers, is so frequently urged? and this is confirmed by a Revelation of S. Brigit to that purpose; from whence *Salme-*



Brigittæ

Revel. l. 4.

c. 13.

Salmero in

1. ad. Cor.

15. disp. 27.

Baron. As-

nal. A. D.

604. n. 59.

Be'l. de

Purgat. l. 2.

c. 8.

Bellarm.

de Purg.

l. 1. c. 7.

Cressy's

Church-

Hist ry,

l. 20. c. 10.

ron calls it an *unanswerable argument*, and *Alphonfus Ciacconius*, published, by the *Popes* authority, an *Apology* for that *Revelation*. Yet *Baronius* tells us, that *S. Matildis* had a *Revelation* to the contrary, and if it were not contradictory to *S. Brigits*, it must be contradictory to it self. And therefore he very fairly rejects them all, but with what honour to his *Church* (which had before approved them) I can by no means understand. And *Bellarmin* to the *Revelation* of *Matildis*, (wherein she desired to know what became of the souls of *Sampson*, *Solomon*, *Origen*, and *Trajan*; and *God* answered her, that none should know what he had done with them) opposes another *Revelation* wherein the soul of *Origen* was seen, together with that of *Arius* and *Nestorius*, in *Hell*. So infallible are these *Revelations*, even when they contradict each other.

How often have *Visions* and *Apparitions* of souls been made use of, to prove the doctrine of *Purgatory*? Witness the famous testimonies to this purpose out of *S. Gregories Dialogues*, and *Bedes History*; which latter is at large recited (being very proper for it) in the late great *Legend* published by *Mr. Cressy* under the name of a *Church History*; who justifies the substance of the story, as far as it concerns the doctrine of *Purgatory*; although he doth not think the person really dead, but only in a *Trance*; which is all one to our purpose, as long as such Arguments as these are made use to prove matters of faith by.

We

We need not go so far back as *Gabriel Biel*, to shew that the doctrine of *Transubstantiation* hath been proved by the appearance of a *Child* in a *Host*; such an Argument hath been lately published to the World: and *Bellarmin* reckons up several to this purpose; one, *wherein instead of Bread, was seen real Flesh*; and another, *wherein Christ was seen in the form of a Child*. Which are well attended with *S. Anthony of Padua's Horse*, which would never have left his Provender to Worship the *Host*, unless he had seen some notable sight there.

*Biel in Canon. Missæ. lect. 51.*

*Bellar. de Sacram. Euchar. l. 3. c. 8.*

And he very doughtily proves *Auricular Confession*, by a certain *Vision of a tall and terrible man with his Book in his hand; which blotted out presently all the sins which the humble Thief confessed upon his knees to the Priest*: but he hath not proved, that terrible man did not represent the *Devil*, who by that Ceremony might shew that he turned over the keeping of his Books of *Accompts* to the *Priest*, who upon Confession, might tell mens sins, as well as he could do without.

*Bell. de penit. l. 3. cap. 12.*

But they have not only attempted to prove matters of Doctrine, by these things; but things have been defined in the Church, meerly upon the credit of *private Revelations*. So the *Spanish Ambassadour* urges the *Pope* smartly upon the Revelations of *S. Brigit*, That there were many of his Predecessors that had determined more things in the Church, partly relying upon *private Revelations* therein, whose authority was not greater than hers were. *Pius I.* he saith, determined

*Festivals appointed on the credit of Revelations. Legatio de Concept. V. Mariæ. Sect. 3. n. 42. p. 371.*

*Bullar. Rom.*  
*Tom. I. p.*  
*147. Cbe-*  
*rubine.*

the Controversie of Easter-day, upon the credit of a Revelation made to Hermes. Urban 4. Instituted the Festival of Corpus Christi, in opposition to the denyers of Transubstantiation, upon the instinct and Revelation of a certain Woman. Paul the Hermite was Canonized for a Saint, upon the Authority of a Vision and Revelation to Anthony; the one of his soul flying to Heaven, the other of his being there. The Feast of the Apparition of the Arch-Angel Michael, which is constantly observed in the Church of Rome, depended upon a Revelation to the Bishop of Siponto, and a few Drovers upon the Mountain Garganus. These are things briefly touched by the Ambassador; but it will not be amiss, to give a more particular account of those instances which concern the Institution of Festival Solemnities; by which it will appear that they are Fanatical even in their Superstitions. Pope Urban 4. in the Bull still extant for the Celebration of Corpus Christi day, mentions that as one of the great reasons of appointing it, that while he was in a lower capacity, he understood that a Revelation had been made to certain Catholicks, that this Feast should be observed in the Church. This which is only intimated here is at large explained by Job. Diestemius Blerus Prior of S. James in Liege, where these things happened. "In an Hospital hard  
 "by the Town, he tells us, there was a fa-  
 "mous Virgin called Juliana, which had  
 "many Extasies and Raptures, and so Pro-  
 "phetical a Spirit as to discern the thoughts  
 "and intentions of her Neighbours hearts;  
 "she

*Apud Bror.*  
*Annal. Tom.*  
*13 A. D.*  
*1230. n. 16.*

" she wrestled with Devils, discoursed with the  
 " Apostles, and wrought many Miracles. But  
 " one thing peculiar to her was, that in her  
 " Prayers she almost alwayes saw the Moon in  
 " her brightness, but with a snip taken off  
 " from her roundness : at which she was much  
 " troubled, but by no means could get it out  
 " of her Phancy. At last *God* was pleased to  
 " reveal it to her, that the Moon signified the  
 " present Church, and that fraction the want  
 " of one solemnity more to be observed in it :  
 " upon which she received a command from  
 " Heaven, to proclaim the observation of this  
 " solemnity. For twenty years, she prayed that  
 " God would excuse her, and make choice of a  
 " more worthy person ; but none being found,  
 " she communicates it to *Johannes de Lausenna*,  
 " and he to *Jacobus de Trevis* then Arch-dea-  
 " con of *Liege*, and afterwards *Urban 4.* But  
 " although all the persons to whom it was  
 " communicated, highly approved it ; yet she  
 " was not satisfied till ( *one of her Gossips,* )  
 " named *Isabella*, after a whole years praying  
 " for it, had the same thing revealed to her,  
 " with that circumstance, that this Feast had  
 " alwayes been among the Secrets of the B. Tri-  
 " nity ; but now the time was come, that it  
 " should be published to the World ; and she, in  
 " one of her extasies, saw very distinctly all the  
 " heavenly orders upon their faces, supplicating  
 " God, that to confirm the faith of Christi-  
 " ans, this day might be speedily observed.  
 " This *Isabella* was so much intoxicated  
 " by this Vision, saith the Author, that out  
 " of

“ of the abundance of her spiritual drunken-  
 “ ness ( they are his own words ) she declared  
 “ she would promote the observing this Feast,  
 “ although the whole world should oppose her.  
 “ Which ( we may well think ) *Juliana* re-  
 “ joyced to hear; and hence forwards, they  
 “ joyned counsels to advance this solemnity.  
 “ *Juliana* gets an ignorant young Priest, to  
 “ draw up an Office for it; and while he writ,  
 “ she prayed, by which the Office was so well  
 “ composed, that it would melt ( saith he ) the  
 “ hardest hearts into devotion: and when it  
 “ was seen by Divines, they said it was not  
 “ written by man, but inspired by God him-  
 “ self. And yet when Pope *Urban* published  
 “ his Bull, upon the credit of these revelations,  
 “ for the Celebration of this Feast, he appoint-  
 “ ed *Tho. Aquinas* to compose an Office for it,  
 “ and rejected that divine Office of *Juliana*.  
 The Epistle of *Urban* to *Eva*, one of the Nuns  
 of *Liege*, and a companion of the two Virgins,  
 is still extant in *Diestemius*, and *Binius* about  
 the institution of this Feast of *Corpus Christi*.  
 And that this was the occasion of this Festival,  
 is not delivered alone by *Diestemius*, but by  
*Arnoldus Bostius* and *Petrus Præmonstratensis*,  
 by *Viguier* and *Molanus*, ( as *Binius* confesseth  
 of this last, ) who can no more be suspected  
 of partiality in this case than *Diestemius*; but  
 we need no other evidence than the Popes  
 own Bull. The story of the other is remarka-  
 ble too, for it is read constantly in the *Roman*  
*Breviary*, upon the eighth of May. It came to  
 pass that among the Doves of Cattle, the Bull  
 of

*Breviary.*  
*Roman B.*

*Maij p. 8:5*

of a certain inhabitant wandred from the rest, which having long sought for, they found in the entrance of a Cave. And when one shot an arrow at him to destroy him, the arrow was driven back again to him that shot it. Which thing so affrighted them all, that they durst not come near the Cave; the Sipontines consult their Bishop, who appointed three dayes fasting and Prayer to seek God in the case; after the three dayes, the Arch-angel Gabriel admonisheth the Bishop, that place was in his custody, and by that act he shewed, that they ought to worship God there, in remembrance of him and his fellow Angels. The Bishop and people go accordingly thither, and they find the place already formed into the fashion of a Temple, and there they perform divine Offices, where many Miracles were afterwards wrought. Not long after, Pope Boniface Dedicated the Church of St. Michael, the third of the Calends of October, in which the Church celebrates the memory of all Angels, but this day is consecrated to the apparition of Michael the Arch-angel. Thus far the 5th. and 6th Lessons of the present Roman Breviary; whereby we understand what infallible grounds the Church of Rome proceeds upon, in all her definitions and observations.

§. 5. And is it not a hard case now, we should be so often told of *Fanaticism* among us, by the members of the Roman Church? Where are the Visions and Revelations ever pleaded by us in any matter of *Doctrine*? Did we ever discard any of the Roman opinions, or practices upon the account of *Revelations*, made to Women, or to any private persons?

Do

Revelations still owned by them.



Do we resolve the grounds of any doctrine of ours, into any Visions and Extasies? have we any *Festivals* kept upon such occasions? Do we collect *Fanatical Revelations*, and set them out with comments upon them, as *Gonsalvus Durantus* hath done those of St. *Brigit*? Have we any mother *Juliana*'s among us? or do we publish to the world the *Fanatick Revelations* of *distempered brains*, as Mr. *Cressy* hath very lately done, to the great honour and service of the Roman Church, *the sixteen Revelations of Divine Love shewed to a devout servant of our Lord (and Lady too) called Mother Juliana*? We have, we thank God, other ways of imploying our devout retirements, than in reading such fopperies as those are. Excellent men! that debar the people reading the *Scriptures* in their own tongue, and instead of them put them off with such Fooleries, which deserve no other name at the best than the efforts of *Religious madness*. Were we to take an estimate of *Christian Religion* from such Raptures and Extasies, such Visions and Entertainments as those are, how much must we befool our selves to think it *sense*? Did ever *H. N. Jacob Behmen*, or the highest *Enthusiasts* talk at a more extravagant rate than this *Juliana* doth? As when she speaks of *our being beclofed in the mid-head of God, and in his meek-head, and in his benignity, and in his buxomness, though we feel in us wrath, debate, and strife: Of being substantially united to God; and that, God is that goodness which may not be wrath, for God is not but goodness: our soul*

16 Revelations of divine love. Ch. 49 p. 112. Ch. 5. p. 12. Ch. 45. p. 105.

Soul is oned to him, unchangeable goodness; and between God and our soul is neither wrath nor forgiveness in his sight, for our soul is so fulsomely oned to God of his own goodness, that between God and our soul may be right naught. That in mankind that shall be saved is comprehended all; that is to say, all that is made and the maker of all; for in man is God, and God is all, and he that loveth thus he loveth all: That our soul is so deep grounded in God, and so endlessly treasured that we may not come to the knowing thereof, till we have first knowing of God, which is the maker to whom it is oned; and therefore if we will have knowing of our soul, and communing, and dalliance therewith, it behooveth to seek into our Lord God in whom it is inclosed: and that worshipful City that our Lord Jesu sitteth in, it is our sensuality, in which he is inclosed; and our kindly substance is beclosed in Jesu with the blessed soul of Christ, resting in the Godhead: and notwithstanding all this we may never come to the full knowing of God till we know first clearly our own soul; for into the time that it is in the full mights, we may not be all holy, and that is, that our sensuality by the vertue of Christs passion be brought up into the substance, with all the profits of our tribulation, that our Lord shall make us to get by mercy and grace. I had in party touching, and it is grounded in kind; that is to say, our reason is grounded in God which is substantially kindness. Afterwards she discourseth of three properties in the Holy Trinity, of the Fatherhead, of the Motherhood, and of the Lordship; and she

Ch. 9. p. 24.

Ch. 36. p.

144.

P. 145.

Ch. 58. p.  
151.

she further saw that the second person which is our Mother substantially, the same dear worthy person is now become our Mother sensual; for we be double of Gods making, substantial and sensual. We may justly admire, what esteem Mr. Cressy had of that Lady, to whose devout retirements he so gravely commends the blasphemous and senseless tittle tattle of this *Historical* Gossip. It were endless, to repeat the Canting and Enthusiastick expressions, which signifie nothing in Mother *Juliana's* Revelations; and one would wonder to what end such a Book were published among us unless it were to convince us of this great truth, that we have not had so great *Fanaticks* and *Enthusiasts* among us, but they have had greater in the *Roman Church*. And by this means they may think to prevail upon the *Fanaticks* among us, by perswading them, that they have been strangely mistaken concerning the *Church of Rome*, in these matters; that she is no such enemy to *Enthusiasms* and *Revelations*, as some believe; but that in truth she hath not only alwayes had such, but given great approbation and encouragement to them. So that among all their visions they do but mix some that confirm their particular Doctrines; as the *Visions of Juliana* concerning the great *Worship of the B. Virgin from her son*, the *holy Vernacle at Rome*, and such like *sopperies*; these make all the rest very acceptable among them.

§. 6. 2. That which they account the *most perfect way of life*, hath been instituted by *Enthusiastick persons*, and upon the credit of *visions and revelations*; and the highest way of devotion in that Church, is meer *Enthusiasme*.

The Monastick orders founded on Enthusiasm.

1. That the *Religious orders* were instituted among them by *Enthusiastick persons*, upon the credit of their *visions and revelations*. The most celebrated orders at this day in the Roman Church are the *Benedictines*, *Carthusians*, *Dominicans*, *Franciscans* and *Jesuites*, and if I can prove this concerning each of these, we shall see how much *Fanaticism* hath contributed to the support of the *Roman Church*. And it is a very fair way towards the proof of it, that *Bellarmin* confesseth concerning the four first, and that of *Romoaldus*, *that they were at first instituted by St. Benedict, St. Romoaldus, St. Bruno, St. Dominick, St. Francis, by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost; and for Ignatius Loyola, if he do not appear as great a Fanatick as ever hath been in the world, we shall be contented to be upbraided with the charge of Fanaticism among us*. It is observable in the life of *St. Benedict*, as *St. Gregory* relates in the second Book of his *Dialogues*, that he was a great hater of humane learning; and that was the first occasion of his retiring from the World, being very much afraid a little knowledge should have destroyed him. He therefore forsook, not only his Studies, but his Fathers house and business; being as *St. Gregory* saith, *knowingly ignorant, and wisely unlearned*: he might as well

*Bellarmin. de Pontif. Rom. l. 3. c. 18.*

*Gregor. Dial. l. 2.*

well

well have said ignorantly learned, and foolishly wise. One might have suspected, it had been rather hatred of his Book than devotion, at his age, which made him run away from School, and his Fathers house; but one of his Visions in his Cave, makes it more probable there was some other occasion of it. But however, away he goes, and only an old Nurse with him, and he requited her soon for it, for he by his Prayers set together the winnowing Sieve which she had broken in pieces, which was after hanged up before the doors of the Church to the Lombards times. But this is nothing to his being three years in a Cave without the knowledge of any but St. Roman, who let him down victuals by a rope and a Bell; and the Devil owing him a great spight, threw a huge stone and broke the Bell. Here he lay so close, that he was fain to be discovered by a vision; and was so devout, that he had forgotten Easter day, till he was put in mind of it by a person, who by a vision was sent to him: and was so little like a man, that the shepherds took him for a beast lying in a den. But at last he is brought to light, and found to be a wonderful person; (for among superstitious people, ignorance and devotion are most admired together) and now many are sent to him for education; having conquered his amorous passions, by rowling himself naked among thorns and nettles: which thorns, a long time after, St. Francis grafted Roses upon, (as Bollandus well observes) which bear in the coldest part of Winter; and of them Rose water is made, which is sent

Bollandi  
Acta San-  
ctorum  
Martii. 21.  
not. in vit.  
Bened. c. 1.

sent as a present to the greatest Princes. He had an admirable Sagacity, in spying Devils; for he saw a little black Devil, which led away a Monk from Prayers; and was fain to pray two days with Pompeianus and Maurus, that God would afford them the Grace to see him too: and at last Maurus being young, and his sight good, saw him; but Pompeianus, being older and wiser, could not. However, St. Bennet sent the little Devil packing with a stroke of his rod; as he did at other times, with the sign of the cross: and easily caused a stone to be lifted up whereon the Devil fate, which could not be stirred before his coming. It would take up too much time, to tell of his Miracles; my business is only with his visions and revelations, by which he could not only foretell things to come, but could discover absent things; so that the Monks could not eat out of his sight, but he could tell as well, as if he saw the meat in their teeth, when they denied it. He discovered Riggo's fraud, when he came to him in Totila's habit; and told Totilas, how long he should reign; nay, if we believe St. Gregory, he knew the secrets of the Divinity, being one Spirit with God: no wonder then the unhappy Boy could not hide one Flask of Wine, nor the Monks receive handkerchiefs of the Women, but he found it out: But admirable was his sight of his Sister Scholastica's soul, entering into Heaven in the shape of a Dove: and another time of the soul of Germanus Bishop of Capua, in a fiery Circle carried by Angels to Heaven: And above all, was his



Poss: 11.

Appar. v. S.

Benedict.

Aquin Sum.

2. 2. qu.

180. a t. 5.

ad 3.

Vasquez in

1. 2. disp.

56. n. 5.

Joh 1. 18.

Chronicon.

Monast.

Cassinens.

p. 65 Lut.

Paris 1668

seeing all the World under one ray of the *Sun*; which he could not do, *Gregory* concludes without a Divine internal light; upon which a dispute hath been raised in the Schools, whether *St. Benedict* saw the *Divine Essence* or no? *Aquinas* thinks not, but only that he had an extraordinary revelation; *Vasquez* doth not seem much to oppose it, but upon two grounds; the one very considerable, that we never read the *Virgin Mary* did it, who ought to have the highest share in revelations and visions: the other only a plain place of *Scripture*; *No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son of the Father he hath revealed him*: As though that were intended to exclude *St. Benedict*, and other Founders of *Religious Orders*, and not rather the *Patriarchs, Prophets* and *Apostles* who came not near them in *Visions* and *Miracles*. But no one hath handled this profound question, with that care and accuracie which *Angelus de Nuce* hath done in his *Notes* upon *St. Gregories* life of *St. Benedict*: he tells us therefore, the *Question* is not concerning the highest sort of abstractive contemplation of any thing short of the *Divine Essence*, for that, he saith, none doubt of; but of an *intuitive vision*, by which the *Divine Essence* is seen clearly in it self immediately, and not in any created Image: the *Negative* he grants is held by *Aquinas*, and many of the *Schoolmen*: but yet he saith, many *Schoolmen* of great note are for the *affirmative*; and he deduces many arguments to prove it, from *St. Gregories* words: but that which adds most weight to it, besides the

the number of authors quoted by him, is that *Urban 8.* in a Bull upon the feast of *St. Benedict*, A. D. 1632. doth expressly assert it. And *Joh. Bona*, a present Cardinal at Rome, saith, that *St. Benedict* was rapt up into the third Heavens, where he heard the Choire of Angels, and saw God face to face: for which, besides *Gregory*, he cites *St. Bernard*, *Rupertus Tuiensis*, *Bonaventure*, *Dionysius Carthusianus*, *Maximilian Sandeus*, and others. And adds to this as extraordinary a thing as any hath been yet said of him, that he and his Sister Scholastica sung very distinctly in their Mothers Wombs; a presage (saith he) of the chearful singing of their Orders. For which he quotes several Authors of the *Benedictines*; and although he grants it may be suspected, because it doth not occur in the more ancient writers, yet he justifies it by many parallel stories. These things are enough, for *St. Benedict's* Enthusiasm. *St. Romoaldus* was as happy as *St. Benedict*, in his ignorance. For, as *Petrus Damiani* reports in his life, when he first entred himself under the discipline of *Marinus* the *Eremit*, he could hardly read his *Psalter*, though he had been a *Monk* three years before; and he adds it as a great instance of his patience, that when *Marinus* in teaching him, did often beat him with a wand upon the left side of his head, for his dulness, he desired his Master that he would now change his side, for he had by his strokes quite-lost his hearing in his left ear: and yet he met with a worse companion, than *Marinus*;

*Joh. Bona*  
*de divina*  
*Psalmodia*:  
*cap. 18. f. 3.*

*Petri Da-*  
*niani vit.*  
*S. Romoal-*  
*di cap. 4.*

*cap. 7.*

Cap. 16.

Cap. 17.

C. 2.

C. 14.

C. 31.

Andreas  
Mugnotius  
de Exemo  
Camaldul-  
lensi. lib. 1.  
Pet. Dami-  
ani vit. S.  
Romualdi  
c. 50.

for, for five years together, he saith, the *Devil* lay upon his feet and his leggs in the night, that he could not easily stir himself. He was so possessed with the thoughts of him, that a *Monk* could not knock at his Cell door, but he asked the *Devil*, what he did there in the Wilderness? and was ready to encounter with the *Devil*, when he found him to be one of his *Brethren*. But the *Devil* once got him down (as he imagined) while he was saying his *Psalms*; and wounded him, and bruised him sadly; but of a sudden he rose up as sound as ever, and went on just where he left. All the crows and ugly birds he saw in the Wilderness, he fancied to be *Devils*, and challenged to fight with them; and exceedingly triumphed, when at his loud cries they fled away. He was converted by a vision of St. *Apollinaris*, as his Father *Sergius* ran stark mad with a vision of the *Holy Ghost*; he wept so abundantly that he never durst say *Mass* in publick, and bid his *Brethren* have a care of shedding too many tears, because they hurt the sight and the brain. Yet, by immediate revelation, he writ an excellent commentary, saith *Mugnotius*, on the Book of *Psalms*; though not very agreeable to *Grammar*, saith *Petrus Damiani*; and being led by the Divine Spirit to the top of a Mountain, in his sleep he saw Ladders reaching from thence to Heaven, and a great many *Monks* going up to Heaven upon them. A divine vision indeed! and he meeting with *Maldulus*, who by great fortune had the same vision, they presently agreed about erecting a *Monastery* there:

If

If the order of *Carthusians* did not begin, upon the story of the *Doctor of Paris* speaking those dreadful words after his death, which is delivered, say the defenders of it, by *sixty authors of the Roman Church*; yet it is agreed on all hands among them, that *Hugo*, who joyned with *Bruno* in laying the foundations of that order, had a vision of *Gods building a house*, of *seven stars conducing them* to the place called *la grand Chartreuse*, from whence the whole order hath taken its name. The *Carmelites* have an especial vision of *Simon Stock*, wherein the *B. Virgin*, upon his devout prayers to her, appeared with the habit in her hand, which she would have them wear, with a promise greater than ever her son made, that *whosoever dyed in that habit, should not perish by everlasting flames*.

6. 7. But *St. Francis*, and *St. Dominiick*, were the persons whom *Innocent the third* saw in a Vision, supporting the tottering *Fabric* of the *Lateran Church*; whereby he understood, what Props and Supporters those two Orders would be to the *Church of Rome*. From hence those high *Elogiums* are given of those two persons, by *Bonaventure*, *Antonius*, *Bzovius* and others; that they were the *two great lights of Heaven*, the *two Trumpets of Moses*, the *two Cherubims* (or rather the *two Calves of Dan and Bethel*,) the *two breasts of the Spouse*, the *two Olive branches*, the *two Candlesticks*, the *two Witnesses*; almost all the noted *two's* of the Bible; but the *two Thieves*, and the *two Testaments*; and these, as will appear presently, were in no great esteem among

*Lauroy de verâ causâ secessus Brunonis in Eremum c. 5. p. 165. Lauroy ib. p. 32, 69. 71. &c.*

*Lauroy de viso Simonis Stocki. cap. 1. The Franciscan and Dominican Orders founded in Fanaticism. Rainald. Anal. Eccles. A.D. 1215.*

*n. 17. Bonavent. vit. Francisci, c. 3. Sect. 8. Sedulius in Elogiis S. Franci.*

Bernard à  
Bustis Ro  
far. p. 2.  
serm 27.

Sed. l. 16.

Jac. de  
Vitriaco  
Hist. O ci-  
dent. c 32.  
Rainald.  
A. 1219.  
n. 14.

Bonav. vit.  
Francis c. 2.

Cap 1.  
sect. 6.

Cap. 2.  
sect. 1.

them. But St. Francis got the start of the other ; for (if a *Canonized Saint* may be believed upon his Oath ) *Bonaventure* did publicly swear at *Paris*, saith *Bernardinus à Bustis*, that *Christ* did reveal it to him, that *St. John* ( *Apoc. 7. 2.* ) by the *Angel* ascending from the *East* having the seal of the living God, meant no other than *St. Francis*. And therefore that is the *Motto* placed under his Picture ; and is applyed the same way by *Pope Leo* the tenth. I shall not take the advantage, that is sufficiently given us by the *Book of Conformities*, the *Alcoran of the Franciscans*, and by the declared enemies of those Orders, to represent *S. Francis* by ; but only take the account given of him, by persons of the greatest reputation in the *Roman Church*. *Cardinal Vitriaco*, who saith, he saw him when he went to *Damietta*, calls him a simple and illiterate man. *Cardinal Bonaventure* is received as the most approved Writer of his life ; and he describes him, as an ignorant *Enthusiast* ; being bred a kind of *Woolen draper*, as appears by the selling his Cloth and his Horse at *Foligno*, after he left off trading upon the Vision of building Churches. His first conversion to *Quakerism* was by *Dreams and Visions*, in which he was sometimes swallowed up in God, as *Bonaventures* expression is, and his soul melted at the sight of *Christ* ; and was so tender hearted to the poor, that he sometimes put off his clothes to give them, sometimes unript them, sometimes cut them in pieces, I suppose, that he might give to the more. All this while, he had no Teacher but *Christ*,

Christ, and learnt all by inspiration; but went besides himself at hearing the voice come from a Crucifix (as any one almost would have done) and it seems he was not well recovered when he came from the Cave; for the people flocked about him as a mad man, and gave him the common Civility to such persons of dirt and stones: and his Father entertained him with dark rooms and chains, as the fittest for him, whom neither words nor blows could bring to himself. But finding no amendment, he made him renounce his Patrimony, and so discharged him; which S. Francis did so readily, that he would not so much as keep the Clothes on his back: Whereby, saith Bonaventure, in a wonderful zeal, and being drunk in the Spirit, casting away his very Breeches, & being stark naked before them all, said thus to his Father, *Hitherto I called thee Father on earth; but hence forward I can securely say, Our Father which art in Heaven.* As though his duty to God, and his Parents, had been inconsistent. The Bishop, in whose presence all this was done, gave order to have his nakedness covered, highly admiring his zeal; and he no sooner had got some rags about him, but he falls to making Crucifixes in Mortar with his own hands, as Children do Babies in the dirt. In this height of Fanaticism he goes about, and preaches to the people, whose words pierced their hearts, much sooner than sense and reason would have done: and he soon brought the superstitious and ignorant multitude, to a great admiration of him; for his very way of saluting the people, he pretended, *he had by revelation*, and as our

Sect. 2.

Sect. 4.

Brev. Roman. 4.

Osob.

Let. 4.

Cap. 3.

Sect. 1.



- Quakers* keep on their Hats, so he might put his off by the Spirit. At last one *Bernard* joyns with him, but *St. Francis* tells him, *They must seek God for direction what to do*; and after prayers, he being a great worshipper of the *Trinity*, in honour to it opens the Gospel three times, and the first three sentences he met with, were to be the rule of their Order: their second Brother was *F. Gyles*, who though an *Idiot* and a simple man, was full of God, as he saith, and had so many extasies and raptures that he seemed to live rather among *Angels* than men. One day when *St. Francis* was alone in a solitary place, He fell into an extasie of joy, and had full assurance of the remission of his sins; and being transported beyond himself, he was caught up into a wonderful light, wherein his mind being enlarged, he foresaw all that should come to pass concerning his Order. His number being increased, to *Rome* he goes, to confirm his Order; the *Pope* rejected him with scorn, but in the night he saw a *Palm* growing between his feet into a goodly Tree; which he wisely interpreting to be *St. Francis*, sent for him, and promised him fair things; and upon the other *Vision* of his supporting the *Lateran Church*, he approves his Rule, and establishes his Order. And his whole life afterwards, was agreeable to this beginning: and the Rule of his Order he called, as *Possevin* tells us, *The Book of life, the hope of salvation, the marrow of the Gospel, the ladder of Heaven, the key of Paradise, the Eternal Covenant*. Let any *Fanatics* be produced among us, (though we are far from looking on them as the
- sub-

*Possevin.*

*Appar v.*

*Franciscus.*

supporters of our Church) who have exceeded S. Francis, in their actions, or expressions. S. Brigit saith of the Rule of S. Francis, that it was not dictated, or composed by the wisdom of man, but by God himself; nay, every word therein, was inspired by the Holy Ghost; which, she saith likewise, of all the other Rules of Religious Orders. What horrible blasphemy is this, which is so solemnly approved in the Church of Rome for divine Revelations? But lest Dominicus should seem to come behind S. Francis in Visions, he tells him at Rome where they met, That it was revealed to him in a Vision, that Christ was just coming to destroy the world for the wickedness of it; and his Mother stopp him, and told him she had two servants would reform it, whereof himself was one, and Christ approved of him, as one that would do his work; but his companion he did not know, till he met S. Francis, and so they embraced one another. Which Vision out of his great humility S. Francis reported, having it from the others own mouth. I shall not insist on any more of Dominicus; nor on the blasphemous Images set up in S. Marks Church at Venice, one of which was of S. Paul, with this Inscription, By him we go to Christ; the other of Dominicus, with this, but by him we go easier to Christ; but I shall proceed to their followers, among whom we meet with one of the most blasphemous pieces of Enthusiasm the world hath ever known.

Brigittæ  
Revel. l. 7.  
c. 30. p. 559.  
Col. 1.

Rainald A.  
D. 1216.  
n. 48.

Wolffæ Le-  
ction. Me-  
morab cent.  
13. p. 509.

The blas-  
phemous  
Enthusiasm  
of the  
*Medicant*  
*Fryers.*  
*Narcler.*  
*Chronos.*  
*Vol. 2. Gen.*  
*40 p. 900.*  
*Spondani*  
*Annales*  
*Eccl. A.*  
*D. 1304.*  
*n. 17.*  
*Billarm.*  
*Chronol. ad*  
*A. D. 1209.*  
*Cæsar. Bu-*  
*laus in*  
*Histor. uni-*  
*vers. Paris.*  
*Tom. 3. p.*  
*49.*

*Rigordus in*  
*vita Phi-*  
*lip. August.*  
*A. D. 1209*  
*Eymeric.*  
*Direct. In-*  
*quist. p. 2.*  
*a. 7.*  
*Francise.*  
*Pegna. Not.*  
*in Direct.*  
*p. 1. pag. 6*

§. 8. For which we are to understand, that in the beginning of the thirteenth Century, one *Almaricus*, a Student in *Paris*, was suspected for some dangerous Opinions, for which he was sentenced to recant; and soon after dyed. Among these Opinions he broached this blasphemy, which was privately instilled into his followers; That every person of the Trinity had his successive time of ruling the world; that the Law of the Father continued till Christs coming; the Law of the Son to their time; and then the time of the Holy Ghost was to begin. In which the use of Sacraments was to cease, and all internal Administrations; and every one then was to be saved by the inspiration and inward grace of the Holy Ghost, without any external actions. They so highly extolled Love, that what would have been a sin without it, they thought to be nothing with it; as Fornication, Adultery, &c. and promised impunity to the women with whom they committed these things, because they said God was only good, and not just. That these were their opinions, is delivered by *Rigordus* who lived in that age, and was upon the place, being a Monk of *S. Denys*, and Physician to the King of France; and by *Eymericus* and *Pegna*, and many others. But by the care and endeavour of the Bishop and University of *Paris*, though they had spread very far abroad, and with a great deal of secrecy, yet by the fraud and artifice of one employed among them, who pretended to Revelations and the Spirit as highly as they could do, they were convicted, condemned, and some of them executed. Notwithstanding

withstanding with severity, about fifty years after this, came forth a Book with the Title of *Evangelium eternum*, or the *Eternal Gospel* published by the *Mendicant Fryers*, and supposed to be written by *Johannes de Parma* about *A. D. 1254.* who was *General* of the *Franciscan Order*, but the Book was received, and defended by both Orders, as will presently appear. But it will be first necessary to consider what the doctrines are, which are contained in this Book; and if ever there were higher *Fanaticism* than is therein, or rather greater *blasphemies*, let them have leave to triumph. The most perfect account we have of it, is from *Nicol. Eymericus*, who was himself an *Inquisitor*, and tells us these Heresies or Errors are contained in it.

*Eymeric.  
Direct  
Inquisit. p. 2.*

1. That the doctrine of *Abbot Joichin* (a great *Fanatick*) excelled the doctrine of *Christ*, and consequently the New and Old Testament.

*Bulei Hist.  
Univ. Hist.  
Paris. To 3.  
f. 5. p. 330.*

2. That the *Gospel* of *Christ* is not the *Gospel* of the *Kingdom*, and therefore is not edifying.

3. That the *New Testament* is to be evacuated, or lose its force, as the Old hath already.

4. That the *New Testament* shall not remain in force, above six years longer; viz. to *A. D. 1260.*

5. That they which shall live beyond that time, shall be in the *state of perfection*.

6. That the *Gospel* of *Christ* shall give way to another *Gospel*, and so instead of the *Priesthood* of *Christ*, another *Gospel* shall succeed.

7. That

7. That no simple man is fit to instruct men in spiritual and eternal things, but they that walk bare foot.

8. That although God afflict the Jews in this world, yet he will save them, though they remain in *Judaism*; and will in the end deliver them from all the opposition of men, remaining such as they are.

9. That the Church hath not yet brought forth Children, nor will do before the end of the temporal reign: which shall be after six years; and by this we are to understand, that the *Christian Religion*, which hath brought forth many called to the faith of Christ, is not the Church.

10. That the Gospel of Christ brings no man to perfection.

11. That the Gospel of the Holy Ghost coming, or Joachims work obtained (called the Everlasting Gospel, or of the Holy Ghost) the Gospel of Christ shall be done away.

12. That no man in Religious Orders is bound to expose his life for defence of the faith, or preserving the worship of Christ, but other men are.

13. That as when John Baptist came, the things that were before must needs be confuted, because of new things coming in their place; so when the time of the Holy Ghost shall come, or the third state of the world, the things that were before must be confuted, for the sake of the New which are to come; from whence it must be understood, that the New Testament must be refuted, and the Old cast away.

14. That

14. That *Christ* and his *Apostles* were not perfect in the contemplative life.

15. That the *Order* of the *Clergy* shall perish; but one of a *Religious Order* shall be preferred above all in dignity and honour; and that as the *Authority* under the *Father* was committed to one of the married order, so under the *Holy Ghost* to one or some of the *Order of Monks*.

16. That those who are over the *Colleges* of *Monks*, ought in those days to think of departing from the *Seculars*, and prepare themselves to return to the ancient people of the *Jews*.

17. That the *Preachers* which shall be in the *last state* of the world, shall be of greater dignity and authority, than the *Preachers* of the *Primitive Church*.

18. That the *Preachers* and *Doctors* of *Religious Orders*, when they shall be infested by the *Clergy*, shall go over to the *Infidels*; and it is to be feared, lest they go thither for that end to bring them in battel against the *Roman Church*, according to the doctrine of *S. John, Apocalips. 15.*

These may suffice out of twenty seven, to let the world know, where the height of *Blasphemy* and *Fanaticism* was first hatched; and no one could imagine, that any who had the face or name of *Christians* should own these things; yet they came from those excellent and inspired persons of the newly founded *Religious Orders*. And if it had not been for the mortal hatred that then was between the  
Uni-



*Matth. Paris. Hist. ad A.D. 1255. p. 909.*

*Oper. Gul. de S. Amore prefat. p. 63. Bulæ Hist. universit. Paris A.D. 1255. Ton. 3.*

*Matth. Paris, ibid.*

University of Paris, and the Mendicant Fryers ( who usurped the Professors places in the University against their will ) God knows how far this doctrine might have prevailed without the least censure. For the Popes were extremely partial to the Fryers, and would hear no ill of them; they now finding them their most useful instruments in all their quarrels with Princes, the Secular Clergy and the People. So *Matth. Paris* relating the Story of the quarrels between the University and the Fryers, tells, *That though the King and the City were for preserving the privileges of the University; yet the Fryers being at the Popes devotion, and doing them a great deal of service, were more acceptable in the Court of Rome, and therefore got the better of the University.* Nay, so zealous was *Alexander* the fourth, in the cause of the Fryers against the University, that in the six years of his Popedom, he sent out near forty Bulls against the University, of which not one now appears in the *Bullarium*: but most of them are preserved in that accurate Preface, before the works of *Gul. de Sancto Amore*, the zealous defender of the University against the encroachments of the Fryers, and in the late History of the University of Paris. In the midst of these heats, some intimation was given the Divines of the University, of such a Book, which was in great esteem among the Fryers, called *Evangelium æternum*, wherein were very dangerous doctrines, which were (saith *Matthew Paris*) preached, read and taught by the Fryers: and were put together by them in a Book, called *Evangelium æter-*

eternum, and taken (saith he) chiefly out of the Books of Abbot Joachim, and Richerius acknowledged, that the Book was composed by the Friars, and that the Divines of Paris by some art got a Copy of it, and extracted some Heads out of it, which were contrary to Faith: and upon that (as Du Boulz saith) they caused it to be burnt publickly at Paris. But not being satisfied herewith, they preached against it, as appears by a Sermon of Gul. de Sancto Amore, at the end of his Works; wherein he saith, That he had seen no small part of that Book, and he had heard, that it doth in all contain more than the Bible; and therein, he saith, it is taught, that the Sacraments of the Church are nothing, that the Gospel of Christ is not the true Gospel; and that the Book it self is the Gospel of the Holy Ghost; and the everlasting Gospel; and that the Gospel of Christ should be preached but for five years to come; that then men shall have another Rule of life, and the Church shall be otherwise managed. Which, saith he, is execrable and abominable to be spoken. But not content with bare preaching against them, he writ a very smart Book in the name of the University of Paris, *De periculo novissimorum temporum*, of the dangers of the last times; wherein he doth at large set forth the hypocrisie, idleness, flattery, and baseness of the Friars; but coming to shew the near approach of the dangers he mentions, he saith, It is now fifty five years (for about that time Almaric broached his Doctrine) that some have endeavoured to change the Gospel of Christ into

Richerii  
Chron. Se-  
xcentis l. 4.  
c. 37.

Bulei Hist.  
p. 229.

Gul. de S.  
Amore opus.  
p. 500.

Gul de S.  
Amore de  
peris. novis.  
temp. c. 8.

p. 8.

into another Gospel, which they said would be better, more perfect and worthy, which they call the Gospel of the Holy Ghost, or the Everlasting Gospel; which will by its coming turn the Gospel of Christ out of doors; as, saith he, we are ready to prove out of that cursed Gospel; and a little after he adds, That this Everlasting Gospel was publickly explained at Paris, A. D. 1254. from whence it is certain, that it would be preached, unless there were some other thing which hindered. And afterwards he saith, That in that Book, this everlasting Gospel is said to exceed the Gospel of Christ, as much as the light of the Sun doth that of the Moon, or the Kernel doth the Shell. This Book of his extremely incensed the Friars, and they presently sent informations against him to the Pope, and by their interest got his Book to be condemned, and burnt publickly before the Pope and the Court at Anagnia, and afterwards at Paris: to which purpose the Pope published a Bull, and denounced the sentence of Excommunication against any who should presume to defend it: and the Writer of it was deprived of his Ecclesiastical Promotions and banished France, as far as the Popes power could do it. All this was done in great haste, before the Legats from the University could appear; and when they came, three of them recanted and returned; only Gul. de S. Amore resolved to stand it out, and answered all their objections, and persisted still in the accusation of that horrible Book: And at last prevailed so much, that the Pope was fain to condemn the *Evangelium æternum*

Chronicon.  
Nichol. Tili-  
vetii ad  
A.D. 1256.

*eternum* together with *S. Amours* Book; but it appears how unwillingly he did it, by his carriage in it, which is related by *Matth. Paris*; for he condemned the other Book solemnly, and caused the sentence to be publicly executed; but he gave order that this Book should be secretly burnt, and as much as might be without any offence to the Fryers. Lo here the true zeal of the Head of the Church! A Book only writ against the Mendicant Fryers is condemned as impious, wicked, execrable, and what not, in the Bull against it; and a Book against Christian Religion in the highest manner, hardly procured to be condemned; and when it is, with great fear of displeasing the Authors and approvers of it. And since that time, they have been very careful to suppress the least mention of the latter, but very forward to set forth the other. For in the *Roman Bullarium*, the Bull against *S. Amours* Book is set forth at large; but not the least intimation of any such Book condemned as the *Evangelium eternum*. So much dearer to the Pope is the honour of Fryers, than of Christ and the Christian Religion! And therefore *S. Amour* said well in the University of Paris, before they went, *That it was to no purpose to go about to procure the condemning that Book at Rome, where it had so many Favourers*; the design of it being to advance the honour of Religious Orders, though to the otherthrow of the Gospel of Christ. It is well these things were written and preserved by Writers of their own Church, and persons of the same Age (out of whom only I have

*Matth. Paris A. D. 1257. p. 939.*

*Bullar. Rom. Tom. 1. Alex. 4. Bull 8. p. 137.*

*Bull. p. 330.*

given account of them ) for otherwise according to their usual Method of confuting things which do not please them, they would be denied with a mighty confidence, and the world should be told, that these are only the *Lies* and *Forgeries* of *Hereticks*. But these are to their shame preserved in their own Books, and we can shew them the very words, if occasion requires it.

The Fanaticism of the *Franciscans* afterwards.

*Guido Carmelit. de heres. Abb. Joachim & Pet. Joh. Alphonsus a Castro advers. heres. v. Apost. her. 1. Pegna in direct. Inquisit. p. 2. q. 9.*

*Eymeric. lib.*

*Heres. 6.*

§. 9. Yet we are not to think, that only the preaching Fryers fell into these extravagancies; for the *Franciscans* had a great hand in them too, and were as forward to promote that which they accounted their common interest. And notwithstanding the Popes condemning the Book, said to be taken out of *Abbot Joachims* Writings, yet his doctrine did in no long time after break forth again in the *Franciscan Order*. For toward the latter end of the same Century, or as most think, in the beginning of the next, in the time of *Clement* the fifth, appeared one *Petrus Johannis de Oliva* a great Disciple of *Joachims*, as *Guido Carmelita*, *Alphonsus a Castro*, and *Franciscus Pegna* affirm. All the difference saith *Alphonsus*, between them was, that *Joachim* made the *Spiritual State* to commence from the founding the *Benedictine Order*, but *Petrus Johannis* would have it begin only from *S. Francis*: Which State, as *Eymericus* relates, where he recounts his errors, began with the *Franciscan Order*, when the Angel of Christ, that is, *S. Francis*, did set his mark upon all his Soldiers; and that *S. Francis* appeared as Christ did

did with his wounds upon him. For we are to understand, that S. Francis in one of his Visions upon the very day of the exaltation of the Cross, had the same bleeding wounds on his hands, feet and side, which Christ had upon the Cross, and carried them for two years together before his death; and lest this should be suspected, Pope Alexander the fourth preached it in S. Bonaventures hearing, that himself saw them, as the sixth Lesson on S. Francis day in the Roman Breviary, and Bonaventure assure us. And who dares question the infallibility of the Popes eye-sight? Unless the Story in latter times of Maria Visitationis, as she was called, Abbess of the Annuntiation in Lisbon, may give some suspicion of it. For this Virgin had gained so great a reputation for sanctity, not only in Portugal, but in Spain, Italy and the East-Indies, that she seemed to be a fit match for S. Francis. And she out-did him in the number of her wounds, for she had thirty two upon her head, caused by Christs putting his Crown of Thorns upon her; and in her hands, and feet, and side, they were as exact as in St. Francis; she made no difficulty of shewing them, if her Confessor bid her, but never otherwise; lest she should seem too much to glory in the honour which Christ had done her. This Confessor was no less a man, than Ludovicus Granatensis, a man highly commended for learning and piety, who as verily believed them, as Pope Alexander did those of S. Francis. One day in the Week she laid raggs to her wounds, upon which the print of the wounds was

Brev. Rom.  
4 Octob.  
Lett. 6.  
Bonavent.  
vit. Franc.  
c. 18.  
Sect. 9.



made. These *rags* with incredible devotion; saith the Writer of the Story, were sent to the *Pope* himself; and to the greatest and most religious persons in all parts, by whom they were received with great Veneration. And when he was *Inquisitor* in *Sicily*, he saith, he saw many of them with her Picture, and a Book of her life and eminent sanctity by a person of great authority, which were preserved as pretious things by the Vice-roy's Lady. But this is nothing to *Gregory the thirteenth* then *Pope*, who writ a Letter of encouragement to her, to go on in the same way of sanctity she had begun. She had been examined by the *Inquisition*, and her wounds were allowed by them after diligent search? But at last they found what she aimed at, which was the *Revolt* of *Portugal* from *Spain*: which being once suspected, she is brought before the *Inquisition*, and her *Sanctity* is condemned, her wounds declared to be a meer Imposture, being artificially made by red Lead, and her self sentenced by the *Inquisitors* to a very severe penance all her days Decemb. 8. A. D. 1588. I suppose, my Adversary having been upon the place, hath often heard the truth of this; but if he doubts it, he may find it, as I have related it, in *Ludovicus a Paramo*. By which it is very easie to guess what it is, which gives and preserves the reputation of these things in the *Roman Church*; for if this *Saint* had dyed before her design brake forth, we might have heard of her wounds in the *Roman Breviary*, as well as those of *St. Francis*, and a *Festival* might have been kept

*Lud. a Paramo de Origine Inquisitionis. l. 2. tit. 2. c. 15. n. 11. tit. 3. c. 5. n. 16*

kept in commemoration of her Sanctity, and herself as religiously invoked, as the rest of the Popes making. But supposing Pope Alexander the fourths authority prevailed so much upon the people, to believe that S. Francis had the same wounds which Christ had, &c. No wonder then, it should be written in the Book called, *The Flowers of S. Francis*, that *those only were saved by the blood of Christ, who lived before S. Francis; but all that followed, were redeemed by the blood of S. Francis.* No wonder, this Petrus Johannis made the Rule of S. Francis, to be the very same with the Gospel, and that which Christ and his Apostles lived by: of which S. Francis was the greatest observer; next to Christ and his Mother; and that as Christ when he was to reform the world, chose twelve Apostles, so S. Francis had twelve Brethren, by whom the Evangelical Order was founded; that those who opposed this Order, were the carnal persecuting Clergy, in whom the Seat of the Beast is much more, than in the people; that in the time of this Mystical Antichrist, the Carnal Church shall oppose the doctrine, life and zeal of the Saints, and burn as it were with fire against them; but it shall be dried up from all spiritual Wisdom, and Grace, and the riches of Christ, and be exposed to errors and delusion as it was with the Jews and Greeks. Those who will not take the pains to see how faithfully I have translated these words out of Eymericus, would imagine I have borrowed some of the canting language of the modern Quakers. But he goes on: saying, *That as Valtin the Queen being cast off from the Kingdom and Marriage of Ahassuerus, the bumble*

*Wolffs Lect. Memor. Cent. 13. p. 522.*

*Esſher* was choſen to ſucceed in her place, and the King made a great Feaſt to his Princes and Servants: ſo in this laſt ſtate of the Church, the adulterous Babylon, the carnal Church being rejected, the ſpiritual Church muſt be exalted, and a great ſpiritual Feaſt be kept to celebrate theſe Nuptials with; that under the Myſtical Anti-chriſt, there ſhall be overturnings and commotions, by which the Carnal Church ſhall be terribly ſtirred up and moved againſt the Evangelical Spirit of Chriſt; but that, the Whore of Babylon, the Carnal Church ſhall fall; in which time the Saints ſhall preach, ſaying, from this time it is no longer the Church of Chriſt, but the Synagogue of Satan, and the Habitation of Devils, which before ſaid in the pride of her heart, I ſit as a Queen in great honour and glory, I rule over my Kingdom, I ſit at eaſe, I am no Widow, i. e. I have Biſhops and Kings on my ſide: that, the Roman Church is that great Whore ſpoken of in the Revelations, which hath committed fornication with this world, having departed from the worſhip; and ſincere love, and the delights of Chriſt her Spouſe; and embraced the world, the riches and pleaſures of it, and the Devil, and Kings, and Princes, and Prelates, and all the lovers of this world. That, the Teachers of this ſpiritual State, are more properly the Gates to lead men into the wiſdom of Chriſt, than the Apoſtles themſelves. Theſe things are expreſſly delivered concerning the doctrine of this Franciſcan Fryer by the Inquiſitour Eymericus; I know, \* *Wadding* in his *Franciſcan Annals* to preſerve the reputation of his Order, would clear him

\* *Wadding.*  
*Annal's*  
*Minorum*  
*ad A. D.*  
*1297.*

from all suspicion of Heresie; but I suppose the credit of an Inquisitour, having such opportunities to know the truth, so near his own time, and having the examination of many of his followers, is to be relyed on rather than the testimony of one at such a distance, and partial for the honour of his order. Especially, that being considered which *Possevin* saith of *Eymericus*, that most of his accounts of the times a little before his own, were the very same with what was contained in a Manuscript in the *Vatican Library*, both as to order and words; which is thought to have been brought from *Avignon* to *Rome*, where he was made Inquisitour General by *Gregory 11. A. D. 1358*. But it is not denied by *Wadding* or others, that the *Beguini* and *Fratricelli*, the *Beguardi* and others were his followers; and we shall find so great an agreement in their opinions, that it would be strange they should be accounted the Disciples of any other. *Eymericus* gives this account of them, that in the time of *Clement 5.* there arose in the Province of *Narbonne*, one *Petrus Johannis* a *Franciscan Fryer*, who published by Writing and Preaching a great many Errours and Heresies in the same Province, and drew many after him, who had spread themselves over *France, Italy, Germany*, and other places, and continued in his time, being daily searched for, and condemned by the Inquisitours. They all agreed that their doctrine was from God by immediate inspiration; and that all the writings of *Petrus Johannis* were revealed to him from the Lord, and that he had

*Possevin.*

*Appar. v*

*Nicol. Ey-*  
*meric.*

*Eymeric.*  
*direct. In-*  
*quisit. p. 2.*  
*quest. 15.*

*Error. 36.*

declared this to some of his Friends; that he was so great a Doctor that from the time of the Apostles and Evangelists, there have been none greater than he in Learning and Holiness: and that his writings, theirs only excepted (wherein they fell short of the former Sect) were the most useful to the Church.

Of the  
Doctrines  
of the spi-  
ritual Bre-  
thren.

§. 10. Their Doctrines may be reduced to these four heads, 1. Evangelical poverty. 2. Unlawfulness of Swearing. 3. The Doctrine of perfection. 4. Opposition to the carnal Church, Which being joyned with that greater degree of light, which they supposed themselves to have above all the rest of the world, makes up a Sect of Quakers after the Order of St. Francis.

1. Their Doctrine of Evangelical poverty; about which they said, That our Lord Jesus Christ as man, and his Apostles had no hing in proper, or in common, because they were perfectly poor in this world; and that this is perfect Evangelical poverty; but the enjoying any thing, though in common, takes off from the perfection of it; and that the Apostles themselves could not without sin have any property in any thing, and that it is Heresie to say otherwise; therefore the rule of St. Francis prescribing this poverty, was that which Christ observed and prescribed to his Apostles, and was the same with the Gospel of Christ, and therefore whosoever adds to it, or takes from it (be it the Pope himself) he is a Heretick in so doing: on which account they condemned John 22. and all the Prelates and Fryers for Heresie, who opposed this Doctrine. For we are not to imagine a Doctrine so contrary to the

the beloved interests of the Roman Church, should escape opposition: nay it was so far from it, that it immediately caused a breach in their own order. For as *Papirius Massonus* well observes from *Petrarch*, none hate poverty more, than they who profess it most; and the Franciscan order had gotten into their hands goodly possessions, and built magnificent houses, and laid up great provisions of Corn and Wine; which these followers of *Petrus Johannis* declare against as directly contrary to the rule which they professed, being the strictest poverty; which this was as like, as hypocrisie is to sincerity, or *St. Francis* to *Christ*. Upon this a great division happens in the Order; between the Brethren that followed *Petrus Johannis de Oliva*, who were called the *Spiritual men*, and the Brethren of the community; both parties appeal to *Clement 5. Alexander de Alexandria*, General of the Order appears in behalf of the Community, and *Ubertinus de Casali* on the other side; But the spiritual Brethren, fearing hard usage at *Rome*; and from their other superiours, choose new ones to themselves, and so make an open Schisme. In the Council of *Vienna*, A. D. 1311. a Decree was made, to declare the rule of *S. Francis*; which is extant in the Canon Law, under the title of *Clementines*, but this by no means effected a cure, for the people favouring the dissenters in the Province of *Narbon*, they turned out all the Brethren of the community; and took upon themselves new habits, to be distinguished from the rest. During this heat, *Gonsalvus* General of the Order,

*Papir. Masson. de Episc. urbis, l. 6. v. John 22.*

*Clementis. l. 5. tit. 11.*

*Balai hist. universit. Paris. Tom. 4. p. 152.*

favour-



P. 166.

favouring the stricter Fryers dyed at Paris, not without suspicion of poison from the looser Brethren. John 22. being Pope resolves to take a severer course with the dissenters, and A. D. 1318. imployes the Inquisitors for that end; the fruit of which was, that they brake out into a more open Schisme and chose one Henricus de Ceva, or de Sena for their General, and kept their Conventicles as John 22. in his constitution, Sancta Romana, declares, and every day added to their Sect. And the more constitutions he published, the greater opposition was made; in so much that Michael de Cesa, Gul. Ockam and others found out Heresies at last in them, and plain contradictions to those of his predecessours, especially that of Nicolaus 4. which Bellarmin confesseth cannot in all things be reconciled. No fewer than eighteen errors Francisc. Pegna confesseth he was charged with in one constitution, to which he answered in another decretal not published, in which they found 32 Errors; but William Ockam went farther, and charged him with no fewer than 90. A goodly number for an infallible Head of the Church! in which there ought to be some allowance for humane frailty, as Benedict 12. his successor pleaded in behalf of Nicolaus 4. when he answered the objections of the Prædicelli against John 22, as may be seen in Eymericus. And his answers are thought so insufficient by Pegna, that he saith, there are some doubtful and some false, which ought not to be passed over without animadversion; and therefore solemnly invokes God, that he may be able

Bell de Pontif. Rom. l.

4. c. 14.

Fran. Pegna in direct.

Inquis. comment. 42.

Gul. Ockam Compend.

enot. Papæ.

Direct. Inquisit. c. 17.

l. 5.

to answer them better : and yet this *Benedict* was accounted a notable Divine, for a Pope ; which made the dissenters, saith *Pegna*, hate him the more. The substance of his answer which *Pegna* is so much displeased with is, that though *Nicolaus 4.* had determined contrary to *John 22.* yet the former definition, being contrary to Scripture, ought not to stand. Thus when Popes fall out, the Scripture comes by its own ; which is, to be the standing rule of all Controversies.

2. They thought it unlawful upon any occasion to swear ; this *John 22.* in his decretal, *Gloriosam Ecclesiam*, charges them with, and that those were guilty of mortal sin, and lyable to punishment, who were under the obligation of any Oath whatsoever : the same is reported by *Wadding*, and others, concerning them.

3. The Doctrine of perfection was stiffly maintained by them. This *Spondanus* would have to be one of the opinions of the *Beguardi*, whom he distinguishes from the *Beguini* ; but not only *Eymericus* and *Pegna* make them to be the same, but *John 22.* in the *Extravagant Sancta Romana* condemns both together, as the title is in *Eymericus*, and in the body of it, it appears that they went under divers names in several places, being sometimes called *Fraticelli*, sometimes *Fratres de penitentia*, sometimes *Fratres de paupere vita*, sometimes *Bizochi*, sometimes *Beghini* and sometimes *Beguardi* ; which latter seems to be the name that they were known in Germany most by. *Eymericus* speaking of *Petrus Olerii* and *Bononatus*, two of

*Spondanus*  
*Annales*  
*Eccles. A.D.*  
1311. n. 7.

*Eymeric. p.*  
2. q. 11.

Alvarus de  
placidu Ec-  
cles. l. 2  
c. 52.

Tur. cre-  
mata Sum.  
l. 4. c. 36.  
part. 2.

Bzov. At-  
nal. A. D.  
1309. n. 12.  
Spondan.

Ann. A. D.  
1311. n. 7.  
Raynald.

Ann. A. D.  
1312. n. 17.

Alvarus  
l. 2. c. 45.  
p. 87.

of the Begardi in Spain, that were burnt for their Heresie by the Inquisitor and Bishop of barcelona, saith, that they held the opinion mentioned before concerning Evangelical poverty, which Spondanus thinks peculiar to the Beguini. About perfection their opinions were these, as Alvarus Pelagius, Joh. Turrecremata, Bzovius, Spondanus, and Raynaldus all agree, that a man in this life may attain to so great perfection, as to live without sin; that a man who hath attained to such a degree, is above ordinances, i. e. he need not fast and pray as others do; that, such as are perfect, have the spirit of liberty, and are not subject to any humane Ordinances, either of Church, or State: That, every intellectual Being hath enough within it self to make it happy, or a light within; so that it doth not need any external light of Glory, in order thereto. That, to live in the exercise of moral vertues, is an argument of a State of imperfection; and that, one truly perfect is above them. From hence they accounted all actions, which were designed to satisfy natural inclinations, to be indifferent; and so looked on unclean mixtures as no sins. Alvarus saith, he saw one of them who was a German, and seemed a very spiritual man, in a very mean habit and looking sorely with tears in his eyes, and full of raptures; and thought himself a Contemplator and a Taster; Names not yet taken up, by any Fanaticks among us. And to let others understand, how easily men were imposed upon by visions and raptures among them, he saith, that he knew a woman, who was afterwards known to be naught, that had raptures

raptures at her pleasure, whom he had honoured as a Saint himself, and the very ground she stood on; and not only he, but many others, even Prelats and Cardinals too: by which he saw evidently how easily the Devil, could transform himself into an Angel of Light; and after saith of the Beguinæ, that under the shew of sanctity they committed many vile things. A strange instance of the impostures of one of the Beguine, who gained a great reputation for sanctity by her constancy and devotion at prayers, her pretending to raptures and extasies wherein her soul was carried to Heaven, her long fastings whereby she imposed upon the Bishop, the Fryers, and all the people to so great a degree that the Bishop was about building a Church on purpose to lay her in, that all comers might behold her who led such an Angelical life; and how accidentally the imposture was discovered, to the great dissatisfaction of them all, but especially the Bishop, is at large related by Richerius.

4. But notwithstanding all this, they had a mighty zeal against the carnal Church; and called all those blind, who were not of their way, as Eymericus saith of them; in these matters they followed Petrus Johannis, of whose opinions about the Church we have already spoken; any that suffered among them, were cryed up as Martyrs; and four of the Brethren suffering at Marseilles A. D. 1316. they said they were so far from suffering as Hereticks, that they were as good Martyrs as St. Laurence, or Vincentius; that Christ was spiritually Crucified in them; that all who approved or consented to their death, Pope, Prelats

Richer. ii  
Chronic.  
Senexense l.  
4. cap. 18.

Eymeric. p.  
2 q. 15.  
c. 7. 41.

Error. 20.

Q. 16. f. 2.

Gerfon. oper.  
Tō. I. p. I.  
pag. 574.

Prelats or others were all Hereticks for it; and lost all right of governing the Church, or administering Sacraments; and are out of the Church, and therefore not in a state of Salvation, and they only are the true Church. These are the chief of their doctrines, although Eymericus reckons up no fewer than fifty five Errours and Heresies among them. And notwithstanding all the care used by Popes and Inquisitours against them, in the time of Clement 5. John 22. Benedict 12. Clement 6. Innocent 6. and afterwards, they not only continued, but spread themselves still further. John Garson; who lived in the beginning of the next Century, mentions not only the doctrines of the everlasting Gospel, but those of the Begardi, the substance of which he saith is, *that a perfect soul being reduced to God, loseth its own will, so that it hath no other will but the divine will, which it had from eternity in that Ideal being which it had in God: which being supposed, they say, they may do any thing which their affection puts them upon, without sin; because they have no will of their own.* The way of renouncing their own will was somewhat different, he tells us; for the more cunning pretending to do it only to God; but these prevailed upon the other, to renounce their own wills before them, which when they had done, they told them they could now sin no longer: and so did what they pleased together. Under which pretext of renouncing their own wills, all manner of wickedness was committed among them. Neither were they only in France, Italy, Sicily and Germany, but they

they prevailed much in Spain too : for in the time of *Benedict* 12. in *Catalonia* there were many *Beguardi* saith *Eymericus*, the chief of whom was *Fryer Bonanatus* who was burnt for his Heresie ; in the time of *Clement* 6. there arose many of them in the Province of *Valencia*, whose leader was *Jacobus Justi*, and was therefore immured and so dyed. In the time of *Innocent* 6. *Urban* 5. *Gregory* 11. appeared in *Catalonia*, one *Arnoldus Montanerius*, who publickly. Preached for nineteen years together, the opinions of the *Begardi* about poverty, and added these of his own, that no one can be damned who wears the habit of *St. Francis*; that *St. Francis* once a year goes down into *Purgatory*, and thence draws the souls of all that have been of his order, and carries them to *Paradise*. These we have from *Eymericus*, who saith that by order of *Urban* 5. and *Greg.* 11. he sate as *Inquisitour* upon him. And, lest we should think this *Sett* inconsiderable among them, *Ludovicus de Paramo*, the *Inquisitour* of *Silicy*, declares, that the *Fratricelli*, carrying an appearance of Sanctity with great poverty drew the hearts of all men to them, and drave *John* 22. into great straights, and by the *Schisme* they raised, gave a great disturbance to the whole Church. Neither was it of any short continuance, if we consider the fundamental principles of this *Sett*, which were immediate revelations, renouncing property, and liberty of actions: for so it began, with *Almerick* at *Paris*, and we have seen how much afterwards promoted by the *Mendicant Fryers*; and especially by those who called

*Eymeric.* p.  
2.7.11 f.5.

*Lud. de*  
*Paramo de*  
*orig. sancte*  
*Inquis. l. 2.*  
*tit. 3. cap.*  
*4. n. 23.*



Spondan.  
*Annales*  
 A.D. 1294.  
 n. 9.  
*Bulle hist.*  
*universit.*  
*Parif. Ton.*  
 3. p. 510.  
 Of the  
 continu-  
 ance of this  
 Sect.

Platina in  
*vit. Clem. 5.*  
*Spondan.*  
*Annales.*  
 A.D. 1297.  
 n. 9.  
*Prateolus*  
*de heres.*  
 l. 8 v. Her-  
 man.  
*Paramo de*  
*orig. inqui-*  
*fit. l. 2. tit. 3.*  
 c. 4. v. 38.

called themselves of the *third Order of St. Francis*, and pretended to far greater strictness as to their rule than others: on which account *Celestine 5. A. D. 1294.* gave them first liberty to separate themselves from the Community, which was afterwards pleaded by the *Fratricelli*, against *Clement 5.* and *John 22.*

§. 11. But besides these who before were of this order, others took up the same way and opinions, which were never originally of it; as the followers of *Geraldus Segarelli*, and *Dulcinus*, in Italy, who are called *Fratricelli* by *Platina*, by others *Pseudo-Apostolici* and *Dulcinista*. *Spondanus* confesseth those in Italy, who were the followers of one *Hermanus* of *Ferrara*, to be the same with the *Fratricelli* and *Beguini*; whose body saith *Prateolus*, after he had been twenty years worshipped for a Saint, was by the command of *Boniface 8.* taken up and burnt for an Heretick: *Ludovicus de Paramo* saith that it was thirty years after, he had been publicly worshipped by the people of *Ferrara*; and he reckons up this, as one of the great blessings which comes by the *Inquisition*, that they are thereby undeceived in many whom they worship for Saints, of which he gives several other instances. But the burning of *Hermanus* bones, did not extinguish the Sect of *Fratricelli* there; the only effect of this severity was, that they grew more numerous and bold, as *Prateolus* and *Spondanus* confess. They kept their *Conventicles* more frequently, and spread the further; insomuch that great multitudes of people fell in with them: Among whom as their chief leaders

were

were several of the Order of S. Francis, as Spondanus proves from the Extravagant Sancta Romana of John 22. And of the same Sect were the Pseudo-Apostolici, whose chief leaders were Geraldus Segarelli and Dulcinus one of his Disciples; the one of Parma, the other of Novara: these filled all the Country thereabouts with their errors, saith Eymericus, and made an Independent Congregation among themselves, which acknowledge obedience and subjection, as he adds, to none but God himself; and said that they followed the Apostolical rule, in a very singular manner. This Geraldus, saith Paramo, and his followers, by a shew of extraordinary sanctity, drew many to their party: but Friar Salimbenus (in a Manuscript seen by Pegna, in the Library of Cardinal Savelli at Rome) bring himself a Franciscan, gives this account of him, whom he calls Gherardinus Segalellus; that being desirous to be admitted into their Order, he was refused by them; after which he spent some time in the Franciscans Church, where observing the pictures of the Apostles, and the habits they were drawn in, he put himself as exactly as he could into the very same habit; and having sold his house, and received the money for it, he distributed it all among the people; and afterwards got a Companion, who was a servant to the Franciscans: but by degrees their number increased, so that in a short time they spread over many Cities in Italy: and from thence were dispersed over almost all Europe: They went up and down in the streets, saith Eymericus, Preaching Repentance with a white Man-

Direct. In-  
quist. p. 2.  
q. 12.

Paramo l. 2.  
tit. 3. c. 4.  
n. 19.

Pegna. not. is  
direct. p. 2.  
q. 12.

tel a white Coat, and long hair, barefoot and bareheaded, and what they eat, was publickly in the streets, and only what was given to them : after forty years in which they mightily prevailed, Boniface 8. caused Gerald to be taken and burnt; upon this Dulcinus with six thousand of his Companions retired into the Alps, where they increased so much, saith Pegna, that Clement 5. was forced to send a Croisado against them : where they starved a great part of them ; but Dulcinus and his Wife Magareta, as Patreolus calls her, were taken and burnt. It is not credible, saith Bzovius, how long they endured upon the Alps, all extremities of hunger and cold, rather than they would yield to their Adversaries. But notwithstanding all the endeavours could be used, they could not wholly extinguish that Sect, saith Prateolus ; but the remainders of it were still left in the Mountains, about Trent, and continued to his time, which was about A. D. 1560. These were of the same opinions with the Fratricelli before mentioned, as to the Roman Church ; that by reason of the wickedness of the Clergy and Religious Orders, it was a reprobate Church, and the Whore of Babylon ; but being no more content with this, than the greatest Fanaticks of our Age, they pretended to great things themselves, that they were the only spiritual Congregation, sent, and chosen out by God to bear testimony to his truth, in the last ages ; and that they, and only they, had the power which S. Peter had ; that Geraldus Segarelli, was a plant of Gods own planting, growing up from the root of faith ; by whom God began the work of

Refr-

Bzov. An-  
 nales A. D.  
 1309. n. 13.

Prateolus de  
 her. l. 4. v.  
 Dulcinus.

Reformation of his Church, to the purity, perfection, life, state and poverty of the primitive Church, in that state wherein Christ committed his Church to S. Peter. That they only are the Church of God, and in that perfection wherein the Apostles were, and therefore are bound to live in subjection to none, because their rule which was immediately from Christ, is free, and hath the greatest perfection; that no one can be saved, who is not of their Order; that it is a sign any one is in a state of damnation, to persecute them: that all the Popes from Sylvester downward, and all the Prelates, were Impostors and Deceivers, excepting only Celestine 5. who renounced his Popedom, and gave leave to the Spiritual Brotherhood to separate from the rest in the Franciscan Order. That the Orders of Clergy and Religion are dangerous to the Church. That no laymen ought to pay any tythes to Priest or Prelate, who lives not in the same perfection and poverty which the Apostles did. That it was as well to Worship God in Woods or Stables; or Barns, as in consecrated Churches: That it was unlawful for Christians to swear at all, saith Prateolus; or never but in case of the Articles of faith, or the divine commands, say, Turrecremata and Eymericus; but in all other cases, it was lawful to use equivocations and mental reservations, and to deny their Sect with their mouths, as long as they kept true to them in their hearts. That nothing was unlawful which was done out of a principle of Love: and that all things, in the worst sense, were to be common among them; and therefore they are charged with allowing and

*Turrecremata*  
*la Sum. de*  
*Ecclef. l. 4*  
*p. 2. c. 37.*  
*Eymer. c. p.*  
*2. q. 12.*  
*Prateolus*  
*l. 14. n. 41.*  
*Spondan.*  
*A.D. 1370.*  
*n. 16.*  
*Raynald.*  
*A.D. 1311.*  
*n. 66.*  
*Nauclet.*  
*Gen 44.*  
*p. 986.*  
*Gaultieri*  
*Chronol. sec.*  
*1300. c. 8.*

practising promiscuous mixtures among themselves, if their Adversaries do not charge them as unjustly in this point, as the Primitive Christians were charged by the Heathen. This is the sum of their Principles and practices, as they are reported by *Turrecremata*, *Eymericus*, *Prateolus*, *Spondanus*, *Raynaldus*, and others. But that which is still observable to our purpose is; that these were looked on as a sort of Friars in the Roman Church; for when *Honorius 4.* condemned them by his Bull extant in *Eymericus*, he doth it upon this account, that they were a sort of Mendicant Friars not approved by the Roman See, whereas *Greg. 10* in the Council of Lyons had absolutely forbid all Orders of Mendicants after the Lateran Council, that should not receive express confirmation from the Pope; but his Holiness was informed, that some who called themselves of the Apostolical Order, had since that time assumed to themselves a new habit of Religion, without due applications being made to his See; and a great number of these went up and down, as Mendicants, into many parts of the world, doing unseemly things to their own peril and the scandal of others; especially some among them being guilty of Heresie: therefore all Ecclesiastical Officers, are required, to admonish and compel them to lay down their habits, and to enter themselves among some of the approved Religious Orders; and in case of refusal they ought to proceed judicially against them, and to deliver them over to the Secular power. By which we understand the true ground of the quarrel against them; viz.

not

not yielding subjection enough to the Roman See, and how easily all their Blasphemies and Villanies might be forgiven, if they entred themselves into any of the approved Religious Orders.

§. 12. As we see all the care used could not root out this Sect wholly, but the remainders of them continued in some of the Mountains of Italy; so I am very much mistaken if the Alumbrado's in Spain, or the Sect of Illuminati, were any other than a remainder of the Beguini and Fratricelli whom we observed before to have got footing there. Spondanus indeed and some others from him, say, they were detected in the Diocesses of Sevil and Cadiz, A. D. 1623. and were condemned by Andreus Pachecus, the general Inquisitor in Spain, in twenty six Articles, and the seven chief of them were burnt: but withall he saith, they were not so much a new Sect, as a renewal of an old one with some additions. Nay we meet with the very same name of the Sect, long before that: For Ludovicus de Paramo saith, that several Priests were taken, by order of the Inquisition, in the Town of Lerena; who under pretence of extraordinary illumination from God, did gain upon the people, and spread dangerous opinions among them. And afterwards he particularly describes them, under the names of the Illuminati, by their pride and disobedience to their Superiors, by their obstinate adhering to their Illusions, and indulging themselves in their sensual lusts; all which fully agree to the Character already given of the Fratricelli and Begardi. For the first he saith, they chose

Cf. the A-  
lumbrado's  
in Spain.

Spondan.  
Annales.  
A. D. 1623.  
n. 7.

Lud de Pa-  
ramo de ori-  
gine Inqui-  
sit. l. 2. tit.  
3. c. 5 n. 15.

Lib. 3 q. 5:  
n. 186, &c.



rather to be broken in pieces, than give obedience to their Bishops; for the second he proves, that as long as they gave way to sensual lusts, their illumination could not be from God; for they who would sleep in the Divine light, as he speaks, must have their eye-lids shut as to all worldly vanities and pleasures; therefore we ought to shun such illuminated, or rather blind persons, who transform themselves into Angels of light, spreading divers Doctrines and Revelations which they have; of whom he interprets the Epistle of S. Jude. By all that hath been said, this Sect seems to be nothing else but Gnosticism, revived under new shapes and names; and with a difference of opinions, suitable to the age wherein it appeared. Spondanus gives this account of the opinions and practices of the modern Alumbrado's, that under a pretence of mental Prayer and Divine contemplation, and union with God; they despised the use of Sacraments, Preaching the Word of God, and all holy exercises; and did extol the other so highly, that they said these things would not be sins in them, which were so in others, and by this means committed all impurities. Of this Sect Ignatius Loyola was vehemently suspected to be, and upon that account was cast into Prison by the Inquisition in Spain. Which

Masseius himself doth not deny, that it was upon the account of the Illuminati, and his Enthusiastical Preaching in the Streets, that he was questioned. But Melchior Canus that learned Bishop of the Canaries puts the matter out of dispute, for in a discourse of his concerning the foundation of the Society of Jesus, preserved entire

N. 212.

N. 238.

Masseius in  
vit. Irenaei  
l. c. cap. 17.

ture in the hands of *Dominicus Canus* Bishop of *Cadix* his Nephew, and published in part by *Schioppus*, he saith, that the General of that Order was one *Innico* who fled out of Spain, lest he should be laid hold on by the Inquisition, being suspected for the Heresie of the *Illuminati*; and coming to Rome, he desired to be judged by the Pope, where no accuser (appearing he was absolved. He gives him the Character of a vain man; for, being once in his company at Rome, he presently without any occasion began to boast of his righteousness, and the unjust persecution he had suffered in Spain: and spake many and great things of the Revelations he had from God, without any necessity; upon which account he saith, he believed not any thing at all concerning them. Another day, he adds, when he went to dine with him, he commended one of his Brethren for a great Saint, who coming into the room where they were, he presently suspected the man to be mad: and when he talked with him about matters of Religion, he answered heretically, not out of design, but because he was an Ideot, a rude, ignorant fellow. *Ignatius* being confounded at this, said he was no Heretic, but a Fool; but he believed he had some lucid intervals; and at that time by reason of the conjunction of the Moon, he was not a very sound Catholick. See from what Man, the Jesuits derive the infallibility of their faith! But although *Canus* was a person of more learning and judgment than a thousand *Ignatius*'s; yet the Jesuits decry him as very partial against them: for *Orlandinus*, in his History of the Society, complains of him as one of the bitterest enemies

*Schiopp. In-*  
*fam. Fami-*  
*ari, p. 62.*

*Orlandin.*  
*hist. Societ.*  
*Jesu. l. 8.*  
*n. 46.*

2 Tim. 3. 1.  
to v. 8. :

they had in the beginning of their Society; for he every where set them forth as the Fore-runners of Antichrist, and explained the Prophecy of them, concerning the men that should be in the last times. Wherein it is said, Men shall be lovers of themselves, covetous, boasters, blasphemers, &c. Traytors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures, more than lovers of God, having a form of Godliness, but denying the power thereof: For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts, &c. The same thing (saith Orlandinus and truly) was charged upon the Orders of the Dominicans and Franciscans, as well as them: and we shall not quarrel with them, which Order of them all hath the greatest share in the accomplishment of this Prophecy.

The Jesuits  
Order  
founded in  
Fanaticism.

§. 13. That which is our present business, is to shew that this Order was instituted as the other were, upon the credit of *Visions* and *Revelations*; for Ignatius was certainly as Ignorant and Enthusiastical as S. Francis himself; and to prove this, I shall only make use of those of his own Order, who have writ his life (Masseius, Orlandinus and Ribadeneira) and pursue it no farther than the institution of the Order, as I have done with the other. The first remarkable thing in him was, that he was converted by reading the *Legends* of the *Saints*, as Don Quixot began his Errantry by reading the old *Romances*: I wonder how Ignatius did to read them, for Masseius describes him, as one that had hardly ever learnt his let-

Masseius  
vit. Ignat.  
l. 1. c. 1.

ters:

ters : but it is possible St. Peter taught him, for they all write that St. Peter appeared to him, before he was so far recovered as to be able to read.

Ribadenira  
vit. Ignat.  
c. I.

But this Country-man was not more moved with the adventures of former *Knights*, than *Ignatius* was with the stories of St. *Dominick* and St. *Francis*; for these, *Masseius* tells us, did particularly work upon him: in so much that before he took up a firm resolution of Religious Errantry, he would put cases to himself of the difficult *Adventures* of those two illustrious Heroes; and found himself to have mettle enough, to undertake any of them: and therefore in a fit of zeal, one night he gets out of his bed, and fell down upon his knees, before an Image of the B. *Virgin*, and in that posture vowed himself her Knight. Which is a circumstance so considerable, I admire that *Masseius* omits it; as he doth likewise the strange noise in the house, the trembling of the room, and the breaking of the glass windows that time: an argument, saith *Orlandinus*, that the Devil then took his leave of him; although there be some reason to doubt it. After this, the V. *Mary* appeared to him with a great deal of glory, with her Child in her lap, ( and all this while, for the vision continued for some time, he thought himself awake ) by which sight he was hugely animated for all his future adventures. The first whereof was to a place of great devotion to the B. *Virgin*, called *Montserrat*; and in the way thither, he was like to have begun his first adventure

Ribadenira  
c. I.  
*Orlandin.*  
bist. l. I.  
n. 12.

adventure with a *Moor*, who allowed the *B. Virgin* to have been so till her delivery, but would not yield it afterwards ; at which *Ignatius*, considering whose *Knight* he was, began to be so enraged, that he thought it necessary to revenge her quarrel upon him ; but disputing with himself what to do, and the *Moor* being gone another way, he leaves the cause to the wisdom of the *Mule*, and puts the Reins in his neck, that if he took the *Moors* way at the parting of the two ways he would have his life ; but the good *Mule* understanding his Riders mind, left the beaten road, and went on to *Montserrat* : where a remarkable Ceremony was performed by him, for as *Orlandinus* and *Masseius* expressly say, *Ignatius having read in Books of Chivalry, that the ancient Knights at their first entring upon that honourable employment, were wont to watch all night in their arms*, he thought it fit to begin his Errantry in the same manner ; he therefore hangs up his *Sword* and *Dagger*, before the *Altar* of the *B. Virgin*, and puts on his habiliments ; but instead of his shining Armour, he had gotten a long *Coat* of Sack-cloath, with a cord about it, at which he hangs his bottle for water ; and instead of his *Lance*, a plain Crab-tree staff, with a wicker shoo upon one foot, and the other naked ; having no *Morriion* on his head, but exposed that to the violence of the weather. All these habiliments ( having procured them by the way, ) he hung at the pummel of his Saddle, when he entred the *Town*, saith *Masseius*, ( for fear the people should think him in his wits )

*Orlandina.*

*hist. l. 1.*

*n. 18.*

*Massei. l. 1.*

*c. 4.*

*Masseius l.*

*1. c. 3.*

wits ) but he puts them not on, till he came to the sacred place where he was, by the *Laws of Chivalry*, to watch in them; and so he did, say they, *Sometimes standing, Sometimes kneeling, and devoting himself with all his might to the service of the B. Virgin*. Which having done, *early the next morning* ( for that is a necessary circumstance too in the adventures of Chivalry ) *away he goes for Manresa*; where he takes up his lodging in the *Town-Hospital*, and lets his Hair and Nails grow, and begs from door to door ( and yet fasted six days in the week ) he whippes himself thrice a day, was seven hours every day in vocal prayer, lay upon the bare ground, and all to prepare himself for his adventures to *Jerusalem*. Which sort of life growing very uneasy to him, he was once near, saith *Masseius*, throwing himself out of a Window, to put an end to it; but God ( having designed his order, for a further punishment to the world ) nor permitting that; not long after, he had such clear *divine revelations*, that in a moment of time, saith *Masseius*, he understood the greatest mysteries of *Religion*, and the most subtle speculations in *Philosophy* ( especially the way of *Gods* making the World, was made clear to him, but not so as he could express it to others ) which other men cannot attain to with the hardest study and pains. In one of his Visions, saith *Orlandinus*, while he was repeating the Horary Prayers of the *B. Virgin*, he saw the *B. Trinity*, as plainly as we do one another, under a corporeal representation; and was so full of joy at it, that he could not hold

*Masseius*  
l. i. c. 6.

C. 7.

*Orland. l. 1.*  
n. 27.



N. 28.

N. 32.

Ribaden. i. v.  
c. 4.Orland. l. i.  
n. 34.

N. 35.

N. 44.

hold weeping before all the people; and was so enlightened by it, that although he was yet very ignorant, he began to write a Book of the glory of the B. Trinity. In one of his extasies, he continued eight days; in which it is probable, saith the same Author, he saw the frame and model of the Society of Jesuits. A Blessed sight! if he saw all the consequences of it too. After this, in order to his voyage to Hierusalem, away he goes for Barcelona; where Elizabeth Rosella espying him at Church sitting among the Boys, she saw a great shining about his mouth, and heard a voice within her, which bid her call that man to her house. While he was in Italy, in his way to Hierusalem, Christ appeared to him again at Padua, as he was wont to do at Manresa: at Venice, one of the Senators had a vision concerning him, checking him for lying in so much state, while that holy man Ignatius lay in the open air. Visions were grown so familiar with him now, that it is to no purpose to recount those, which he had at Hierusalem, and elsewhere. In his return through Italy, the Spanish Soldiers used him hardly, taking him for a Spy, and carried him to their Commander, now, saith Orlandinus, it had been his custom, not to give men any titles of respect, but to call them only by their common names; and he questioned a little with himself, whether he ought to break that custom, now he was to appear before the Commander; and resolves it in the Negative, because to do it proceeded from too great fear of men: therefore being brought before him, he

gives

gives him no testimony of respect either in his words or actions; and particularly ( both *Maff. c. 16.* *Maff. c. 16.* *Maff. l. 1. c. 16.* *Orland hist. l. 1. n. 47.* *N. 49.* *room* ) he would not put off his Hat to him. By which we understand, who was the first Founder of that Fanatick Sect among us, which is distinguished so much from others, by denying common civilities to men. Upon this, the Commander severely rebuked the Souldiers, for bringing a mad man to him; at which they were so enraged, that he might have saved himself the labour of whipping himself that day, they doing him that office very effectually. Being returned to *Barcelona*, at thirty three years of Age, he begins to learn his *Grammar*; to enable him, I suppose, to express those mysteries of Religion and Philosophy which he understood so cleerly by Revelation: but as *Masseius* observes, he could not have *Amo* in his mouth, but his mind was carried he knew not whither, and was so full of visions all that while, that he could not remember one word that he learnt; upon which he begs his Master, falling in great humility at his feet ( having it seems more reverence for him, than he had for the Spanish Officer ) that he would tie him punctually as he did the Boys to his Lessons; and if he could not say them, that he might be whipt as they were. But as dull as he was at his Book, he had so great elevations in his Prayers, that ( if we believe him ) one *John Paschal*, saith *Orlandinus*, saw him railed up from the ground in a dark night; but that being a suspicious circumstance, he adds that the

Maffei. l. i.

c. 17.

Orland. l. i.

n. 56.

N. 61.

Maffei. l. i.

c. 17.

room at the same time was filled with a great light. Having staid out his two years at School in Barcelona, to the University he goes, where he privately studies *Logick*, *Physick*, and *Divinity* together; to very little purpose, as *Maffei* confesseth; and in the mean time, *Preaches, and Beggs in the Streets*. Here he was several times under examination by the Inquisition, and once imprisoned for forty one days; out of which he was not dismissed, till they had commanded him not to Discourse of *Divinity* again, till he had studied four years, and to wear the same *habit* with other *Students*. Upon this he removes to *Salamanca*, where he finds no kinder entertainment, being put into chains in the *Dungeon* and strictly examined; For here he follows his former course; he and his companions in an *Enthusiastical* manner (being meer *lay-men*, as *Maffei* acknowledgeth) going up and down the *Streets*, *Preaching in all places, and to all sorts of persons*; and being examined by the *Sub-prior* of the *Dominicans*, what *Studies* they followed, *Ignatius* very fairly confessed the truth, that they were *unlearned*. He then asked him, why they took upon them to *Preach*; *Ignatius* very subtilly told him, they did not *Preach*; they did only *told forth* to the people in a familiar manner, concerning *virtue* and *vice*; and thereby endeavoured to bring them to the hatred of one and love of the other. The *Sub-prior* told him, this was *Preaching*; which no one could pretend to do, but either by learning, or immediate inspiration of the Holy Ghost;

Ghost ; and since you do not pretend to learning, you must pretend to be inspired. Here *Ignatius* finding himself caught ; resolutely denied to give him any answer, unless he were legally impowred to examine him. *Say you so*, said the *Dominican* ? I will take care of that suddenly : So they were three days kept in the *Convent*, and after that by order of the *Bishop of Salamanca*, were committed to close Prison ; where he Preached to the people with great zeal, who now flocked in great numbers to him, and gloried as much in his sufferings, and talked at the same rate, that the *Ring-leaders* of the *Quakers* are wont to do among us : And just with the same resolution ; for when the rest of the Prisoners made their escape, by the negligence of the keepers, *Ignatius* and his companions would not stir : When they were called to answer, *Ignatius* Preached at large upon several points of Divinity to them, under pretence of answering questions. After twenty two days, promising to submit themselves to the judgement of the *Church*, they are dismissed ; but with a charge, in four years time not to meddle with nice Cases of Conscience ; which *Ignatius* took with so much indignation, that he had a present impulse upon his mind to be gone ; and no consideration whatever could hinder him, but away he must go to *Paris*, to see if he could meet with any better success there. And accordingly he begins his journey, driving all his learning before him, which was an *Ass laden with Books* as *Maffi. l. i.* *Maffius* relates ; and so reaches *Barcelona*, and afterwards,

afterwards arrived safe at *Paris*. Where being sensible of his own ignorance and dulness, he resolves to ply his Book better; and to that end, enters himself among the Boys in the *School*, and begins his *Grammar* again. A sad case! that after two years *Schooling* at *Barcelona*, having been at two *Universities* in *Spain*, and having had so many *revelations*, he should be yet so great a *Dunce*, that he could not tell the rules of *Grammar*. Now he finds it necessary to *pray* and *whip* less, and to *study* more. Here he meets with so cold a reception, that Hospitals Begging, help from Country men, were all little enough to keep him at first from *starving*; but however, after eighteen months, spent in learning a little *Latin*, he applies himself to *Philosophy*; but the *Enthusiastick* heat of his brain was so great, that he had much ado to keep his mind to it; yet at last he obtained his Degree in *Philosophy*, after three years and a half study, or at least so much time spent there. Then he goes to the *Dominican School*, to learn *Divinity*; where he got just enough, to keep him from being a *Heretick*; for so much *Masseius* his words imply. All this while, his *Enthusiastick* head was full of *projects*, in order to the drawing *Disciples* to himself; that he might, in imitation of former *Heroes*, Found a *new order*: For this it is apparent he aimed at, and for the sake of this he went through so many difficulties, and pretended so much to *Enthusiasm*, without which he knew his design could not be compassed. *Orlandinus* therefore tells us, that being at

*Orlandin.*  
*hist. So.*  
*Jes. l. 1.*  
*n. 66.*

*Answer,*

*Antwerp*, ( as he used to make excursions sometimes from *Paris*, to beg a subsistence) being in a company of Merchants, he looked stedfastly upon a young Merchant, and ( not knowing what effect such words might have upon him afterwards ) he called him aside, and told him, *he ought to thank God, who had chosen him to build a Colledge for the Society of Jesus, in his own Country.* By which it is plain, what he designed at that time, before he had yet formed any thing like a *Society*; and the same Author would have men believe, that *God* had then revealed it to him, that he should found that *Society*; otherwise, he saith well, *no man would have taken so much pains as he did, unless he had such a thing in his head.* During his abode at *Paris*, he had prevailed upon three *Students*; and the first thing he perswaded them to, was to give away all that they had and their *Books* too, and to beg their bread; which caused a great heat in the *University*, he being suspected to have made them mad, and by force they took them away, from the *Hospital*, whither he had drawn them. I omit his flying, or rather being carried, as it were in a rapture, from *Paris* to *Rouen*, and the joy and extatick expressions he had in it, his standing up in dirt and mire to the neck, to represent to his companion the filthiness of the sin he lived in, his so narrowly escaping being publicly whipt in the *University* for seducing the *Students*, that *Orlandinus* makes it almost a Miracle: But we are now to take notice, that his design being to form a *Society*; he



Maffei

L. I. C. 21.

Orland.

n. 75.

N. 84.

N. 96.

had, for that purpose, used himself to all the arts of *insinuation* imaginable; accommodating himself to the humours of the persons he had to do with, endeavouring to oblige all men with expressions of the greatest kindness, bearing all affronts with a wonderful dissimulation, as *Maffei* describes him. By these arts he labours, to get some of the most hopeful *Students* in the University to him; and at last prevails upon nine, to joyn with him: he studies their humours and applies himself accordingly; not acquainting them at first with his design, but by degrees prepares them for it: Among them, *Xaverius* at first laughed at him, and despised him; but was at last won by his obsequiousness, flattery, and insinuation. And finding his former Disciples soon grew weary of him and forsook him, he resolves to tie these faster; and to that end, appoints a meeting in a *Church*, dedicated to the *B. Virgin*, in the *Suburbs* of *Paris*; where they all solemnly vow, before receiving the *Eucharist* (none but themselves being present) either to go to *Jerusalem*, or to offer themselves to the *Popes* service; which was done *A. D.* 1534. upon the day of *Assumption* of the *B. Virgin*, to whose *Patronage* they particularly devoted themselves. After this, *Ignatius* fearing their relapse, kept them together as much as might be, and used all means to prevent any differences happening among them, having now gotten persons to his mind; and for fear the Friends of some of his chief confidants in *Spain* should take them off, he offers to go himself, and dispatch their business for

for them. In his return to *Spain*, he observes his former course of *Preaching* and *Begging*; and was followed by such a multitude of people, that he was fain to Preach in the *Fields*, where (which deserves admiration, in so weak and mortified a man) though he could not raise his voice, yet it was heard distinctly above a quarter of a mile, say *Orlandinus* and *Ribadencira*; but *Maffei* more prudently omits it. But he helps us with as good a passage, instead of it; *Ignatius* was prevailed upon now by his Disciples, to make use of a *horse*, in his journey to *Spain*; which when he was come thither, he left to an *Hospital*; where the people looked on him with so much reverence that no man durst use him afterwards; but, as a *consecrated horse*, he was preserved in ease and good pasture, all his life time. At *Venice*, at the time appointed, his companions meet him, where they debate their voyage to *Hierusalem*; and their custom, *Orlandinus*, saith, was this, in any matter of debate, they were to joyn together in Prayer; and after seeking God, what opinion the most were of that they resolve upon; which they observed, saith he, till the self-denying *Ignatius*, was, after much seeking God in their way, made the *General*; and then his *Will* was to rule them: after a years stay about *Venice* (their courage being now cooled, as to *Hierusalem*) in which time *Ignatius*, and the rest that were yet *Lay-men*, entred into *Orders*; they determine to go to *Rome*, and submit themselves wholly to the *Popes* pleasure: and in the mean time, wander about the Country, Preaching in the *Streets* and *Market-places*, and making use of the

*Maffei*  
l. 2. cap. 1.

*O. landin.*  
l. 1. n. 116.  
*Ribaden.*  
c. 8.  
*Maff. l. 2.*  
c. 1.

*Orland. l.*  
n. 111.

*Maff. l. 2.*  
c. 4.

L. 2. c. 5.

*Bulks of Shops for their Pulpits; and they invited the people to hear them, saith Maffei, with a loud voice and whirling their Caps over their heads; and though few understood them, being strangers, yet all admired and commended them; and no doubt they converted many, as their followers have done, from the use of Laces and Ribbands. All this while, since Ignatius began to have any smattering of Learning, we read little of his visions and revelations; but the time coming near, that he hoped for a confirmation of his Order from the Pope, now saith Maffei, he began to have them again as frequently as he had at Manresa (which in a kind of a religious jest, he saith, he was wont to call his primitive Church) and such as much exceeded the former: for what he now saw, being above humane nature, cannot be expressed; only one Vision did him a great deal of service, which was, that lying in a trance which was frequent with him as well as Mahomet, he saw God the Father commending Ignatius and his Brethren to his Son Jesus bearing his Cross; whom he very kindly received, and spake these words with a smile to Ignatius, I will be favourable to you at Rome: which gave him and his companions great comfort. At Rome, hearing the fame of St. Benedict and his Revelations, or remembring them in the Legends, he withdraws to the same place, Monte Cassino, and there it fell out luckily (that he might come behind none of them in visions) that as St. Benedict saw the soul of Germanus go to Heaven, so did he in the very same*

man

manner, the soul of *Hozius*, one of his *Society*; and a little after, as he was praying to the *Saints*, he saw *Hozius* among them all. Notwithstanding all this, they met with great difficulties at *Rome*; but *Pope Paul 3.* being thoroughly satisfied in the main point, of their being *serviceable* to the interest of that *Church*, all other difficulties were soon conquered; and the *Pope* himself became *Enthusiastical* too, and cryed out, *having read*, saith *Maffei*, *the first draught of the rules of the Society made by Ignatius*, *The Spirit of the Lord is here*, and many things to the same purpose. But one of the *Cardinals*, to whom the examination of them was committed, still opposing the establishing this *Order*, *Ignatius* flies to his usual refuges; for besides *fastings*, *prayers*, *keeping of days*, &c. he and his Friends offered *three thousand Masses* for this end alone: (and it must be a hard heart indeed, that would not yield with so much suppling) this *Cardinal* all of a sudden quite changed his mind, and commended the business himself to the *Pope*: and so the *Society of Jesus* was confirmed by the *Popes Bull*, 3 *Octob. A. D.* 1540. to the joy of *Ignatius* his heart; and soon after he was made *General* of the *Order*, which he accepted with as many tears and protestations, and intreaties (till he plainly saw *it was the will of God it must be so*) as ever any *Usurper* took the *Government* into his hands, which he had most eagerly sought after. And now let the world judge, whether there hath appeared a greater *Enthusiast* or pretender to revelations, than *Ignatius* was, since the days of *Ma-*

*Maff. l. 2. c. 12.*

*homet*, and *St. Francis* ? Methinks they might be ashamed to upbraid, us with the *Fanaticism* of the *Quakers* and such persons ; the chiefest of whom fall very much short of *Ignatius*, in those very things for which they are condemned by us ; yet any one who compares them, would imagine, the *life of Ignatius* had been their *great exemplar*. I know not whether any of that *innocent* and *religious order* of *Jesuits*, had any hand in forming this *new Society* among us (as hath been frequently suggested) but if one may guess the *Father* by the *Childs* likeness, *Ignatius Loyola* the founder of the *Jesuits*, was at least the *Grandfather* of the *Quakers*.

Of the Fanatic way of devotion among them.

§. 14. Thus I have gone through the most illustrious Orders of the *Church of Rome* ; and shewed, how they have been founded on *Fanaticism*, and giving encouragement thereby unto it. It remains now, that I consider the *way of devotion*, in greatest request among them ; and prove, that it doth encourage and promote *Enthusiasm*. For this ; we are to take notice, that those of the *Church of Rome*, who have set themselves to the Writing Books of Devotion, have with great zeal recommended so mystical and unintelligible a way of devotion, as though their design had been only to amuse and confound the minds of devout persons, and to prepare them for the most gross *Enthusiasm* and extravagant illusions of Fancy. But this is the fruit of leaving the *Scriptures*, and that most plain and certain way of *Religion* delivered therein ; there can be no end of Phantastical

stical modes of devotion, and every superstitious *Fanatick* will be still inventing more, or reviving old ones. No Laws or Rules publickly allowed can serve their turn, they must have something peculiar to themselves, to gain a reputation of greater sanctity by; and it is hard, if they do not light upon some affected phrases unintelligible notions, ridiculous or singular postures, that they may be sure to charge those with following carnal reason who condemn them. And they triumph in nothing more, than when they can handsomely revenge themselves on that bitter enemy of theirs, called *Reason*; which they never do with greater pleasure, than when they pretend it to be upon the account of *Religion*. In the *Church of Rome*, the case hath been thus; among them, as in all *Religions* and places in the World, there are some persons of a temper naturally disposed more to *Religion*, than others are; being melancholy, thoughtful, tender, and easily moved by hopes and fears. These do more easily receive the impressions of *Religion*, which they being possessed with, if they be not carefully governed, are more lyable to fall into the dotages of *superstition*, or to be transported by the heats of *Enthusiasm*. Against both of them, there can be no better cure imaginable, than the true understanding the nature and reasonableness of the *Christian Religion*; which fills our minds with a true sense of *God* and *goodness*, and so arms us against *superstition*; and withal acquaints us, that the conduct of the *Spirit of God* is in the use of the greatest reason



and prudence, and so prevents the follies of *Enthusiasm*. But it being so much the design of that *Church*, to keep the members of it from knowing any thing, that is so much against her interest, as the true practice of Christianity is; and therefore keeping the Bible out of the hands of the people, they must substitute some other ways in the room of that, to gratifie the earthly dulness of a *superstitious* temper, and the airiness and warmth of the *Enthusiastical*. For the former; they are abundantly provided, by a tedious and ceremonious way of external devotion, as dull and as cold as the earth it self; to the other they commend *abstractedness of life, mental prayer, passive unions, a Deiform fund of the soul, a state of introversion, divine inspirations*; which must either end in *Enthusiasm*, or madness. And the perfection of this state lying in an *intime Union with God* (as they speak) whereby the soul is *Deified*, is to be attained only in the way of *unknowing* (for nothing so dangerous as the use of reason) and *self annihilation*, and many other things as impossible to be understood, as practised. Which makes it difficult, to give any account of such unintelligible stuff; for we must only grope in obscurity and profound darkness, and draw a *Night piece* without lights. This way came first into request in the *Monastick* orders, by the examples of their founders, as will easily appear by our former discourse; but the men who most solemnly preached and divulged it, were *Rusbrochius, Suso, Harpinus, &c.* and he who, in these latter ages, hath gathered together most that had been

said

said before him, and is commended by *Balthasar Corderius* and others as a most sublime interpreter of mystical Divinity, *Ludovicus Blomius*; from these, it were not difficult to put together some of their words and phrases, as an account of their Divinity; but I rather choose to do it, chiefly from a late Author, published by Mr. *Cressy*, not many years since; who, after his many turnings and changes of opinions, sits down at last (as appears by his published *Mother Juliana's* revelations, and the Preface to *Sancta Sophia*) with the deserved Character of a *Popish Fanatick*. Which Book of *Sancta Sophia*, being compiled by Mr. *Cressy* out of many writings of *Father Augustin Baker*, and set forth A. D. 1657. with large approbations at the beginning and end of it, I hope no doctrine contained therein will be thought a scandal to their Church. The design of it is as the title tells us, *To give directions for the Prayer of Contemplation*, &c I would they had given directions for understanding it, in the first place; for if we have no other help, than what Mr. *Cressy* gives in his Preface, we may as well hope to understand the *Quakers Canting*, as Mr. *Cressy's*. Let the Reader judge of it, by these few passages in his Preface. The only proper disposition, towards the receiving supernatural irradiations from Gods Holy Spirit, is an abstraction of life, a sequestration from all business that concerns others (though it be their salvation) and an attendance to God alone, in the depth of the Spirit. And a little after, the lights here desired and prayed for, are such

*Corderii*  
*Isagog. in*  
*mystic. Theo-*  
*log. Dianys.*  
c. 7.

Preface to  
*Sancta So-*  
*phia* f. 33.

*Inst. Bloffi.  
Instit. Spi-  
rit. cap. 12.*

as do expel all images of creatures, and do calm all manner of passions ; to the end that the soul being in a vacancy, may be more capable of receiving and entertaining God, in the pure fund of the Spirit. What this pure fund of the Spirit means, I had been somewhat to seek, had not Lud. Bloffius in the Preface to his spiritual Institution told us, that the Deiform fund of the soul, is the simple essence of the soul stamped with a divine impress ; or if this be not plain enough, that from whence ariseth a super-essential life : but if yet it cannot be understood, we may be the less troubled at it, since the same Author saith afterward, that very few do know that hidden fund of their souls, or believe that they have such a thing within them. It being, it seems, like some very cunning drawer in a Cabinet, where the main treasure lyes ; which the owner himself cannot find out, till it be broken to pieces : for self-annihilation is necessarily required, in order to it. And this super-essential life, as he admirably describes it, is a certain new and cunning way of knowing without thoughts, of seeing in darkness, of understanding without reason, of unknowing God by perceiving him, of being melted and brought to nothing first, and then being lost and swallowed up in God, by which means all created being is put off, and that which is only divine put on, being changed into God, as iron heated into the nature of fire. This being the state of perfection, aimed at here in this world, we must now consider the directions given in order to it. To this end, [in the first place, a

contemplative state is commended above an active, as more perfect and more easie, more simple and more secure from all errors and illusions which may be occasioned by an indiscreet use of Prayer. Where, by an active and contemplative state, we must not understand what we commonly do by those terms; but the active state is, the use of reasoning and internal discourse, to fix our affections upon God, and expressing it self in sensible devotion and outward acts of obedience to Gods will; the contemplative, in the Authors language is, seeking God in the obscurity of faith with a more profound introversion of Spirit, and with less activity and motion in sensitive nature, and without the use of grosser images; and such souls are not of themselves, he saith, much inclined to external works; but they seek rather to purifie themselves and inflame their hearts to the love of God, by internal, quiet and pure actuations in spirit; by a total abstraction from creatures, by solitude both external and especially internal; so disposing themselves to receive the influxes and inspirations of God, whose guidance chiefly they endeavour to follow in all things. Now, he saith, the security of such a state, above the other, lyes in this; that a contemplative soul tending to God, and working almost only with the heart and blind affections of the will, pouring themselves upon God, apprehended only in the obscure notion of faith, not enquiring what he is, but believing him to be that incomprehensible being which he is, and which can only be comprehended by himself, rejecting and striving to forget all Images and representations of

Sancta Sophia  
treat. 1.  
c. 3. f. 1, 2.

Treat. 1.  
c. 1. f. 45.

Sancta So-  
phia. chap. 3.  
S. 2.

of him, or any thing else; yea transcending all operations of the imagination, and all subtility and curiosity of reasoning; and lastly, seeking an union with God, only by the most pure and most intimate affections of the spirit, what possibility of illusion or error can there be to such a soul? none doubtless; for this is more, than a meer sleep of the soul: for all reasoning and images of things being holy laid aside, there is not so much as a possibility of dreaming left. The next thing he takes notice of, which is very well observed, is that men given to sublime speculations (or I suppose any, who have the use of reason) are not so capable of it, as unlearned persons and Women; and therefore Father Leander à Sancto Martino approves the Book, as containing very sound and wholesom doctrine for the direction of devout souls, and fit and agreeable to our calling and rule; and especially for the use of our Dames; because they might more easily swallow it, as they do pills, without chewing; and so find not any bitterness in it: which is to the same purpose, with that reason Baker himself gives, viz. that the perfection of contemplation scarcely at all lyes in the operations of the understanding. A most admirable way of contemplating with the will: but why might it not consist as well in the volition of the understanding, as in the contemplation of the Will? The proper end of this contemplative life, he adds, is the attaining to an habitual and almost uninterpreted perfect union with God, in the supream point of the spirit (or rather fund as Mr. Cressy more mystically calls it) and such an union,

S. 3.

The appro-  
bations.  
pag. 319.

S. 6.

union, as gives the soul a fruitive possession of him, and a real experimental perception of his divine presence in the depth and center of the spirit, which is fully possessed and filled with him alone. And lest we should think, this were all to be hoped for in this contemplative state, he saith further, that besides this active union, wherein the soul her self concurs, there are others meerly passive, in which God after a wonderful and inconceivable manner affords them interior illuminations and touches; yet far more efficacious and Divine; in all which, the soul is a meer patient and only suffers God to work his divine pleasure in her, being neither able to further, or hinder it. The which unions though they last but even as it were a moment of time, yet do more illuminate and purifie the soul, than many years spent in active exercises of spiritual Prayer, or Mortification, could do.

S. II.

The steps he sets down, in order to this state Cap. 4. S. II. of perfection, are, 1. The way of external and imaginary exercises of Prayer; in which, without a discreet diligence and constancy in them, the soul may perhaps end her days therein. A sad case, to end our days as Christ and his Apostles did; who used this low dispensation of praying to the last! But alas, they never understood these passive unions with God, in the fund of the Spirit; they taught men a plain and intelligible way of serving God, and bid them look for perfection in another world. 2. Aspirations and pure elevations of the superiour Will. 3. The divine inaction. 4. Then



Treat. 3.  
Sect. II.  
cap. I. S. 10.

4. Then when one would least expect them, follow; *woful obscurities and desolations*: and after them; 5. Comes the State of perfection. Elsewhere he describes the progress towards this State of perfection thus, *that he who would come to it must practise the drawing of his external senses inwardly to his internal, there losing and as it were annihilating them; then he must draw his internal senses, into the superiour powers of the soul, and there annihilate them likewise; and these powers of the intellectual soul he must draw into that which is called their unity; and lastly that Unity, which alone is capable of perfect union with God, must be applied and firmly fixed on God; wherein the perfect divine contemplation lies.*

S. 15.

*which union, he saith, all is vacuity or emptiness, as if nothing were existent but God and the soul; yea so far is the soul from reflecting on her own existence, that it seems to her, God and she are not distinct, but one only thing. This is called by some mystical Authors the state of Nothingness; by others (it being indifferent it seems among them) the state of Totality; but the most sublime description of it, is that of the Union of nothing with nothing: which being hard terms to be understood, he explains them thus, that the soul being no where corporally or sensibly, is every where spiritually and immediately united to God this infinite nothing. By which, it is just as intelligible as it was before. Nay, which I think is the highest state of all, it is, that the*

Treat. 3.  
Sect. 4 c. 6.  
S. 8.

S. 9.

*soul comes to a feeling of her not being, and by*

consequence of the not being of creatures; the which is indeed a real truth: or else intolerable nonsense; as we cannot think it otherwise, who know we have cause to thank God, we are yet in our *Wits*, and are not possessed with such a *Spiritual Frenzy*, as this *Autor* saith, *Fier Bernard one of the disciples of* *Treat. 3.* *St. Francis had*; neither was the other free *sect. 4.* from it, who as *Baker* related, in the heat of *S. 19, 20.* his interior affection, could usually cry out nothing but *V.V.V.* Neither can any persons, who have any use of their understandings left, think such discourses the effect of any thing, but of the height of *Enthusiasm* or a *Religious Madness*. I do not think such expressions, as those I have already produced, can be paralleled by the most frantick *Enthusiasts*, that have been since the beginning of the *Family of love*. Yet these Books are licensed, approved, nay admired in the *Roman Church*; whereas we have always disowned, disproved, and condemned any such Writers among us, and have used all care to suppress and confute them. The plain effect of such *Enthusiastick* fooleries is, to make Religion laughed at by some, despised by others, and neglected by all, who take no other measures of it, than from such confounded Writers. If once an unintelligible way of practical *Religion*, become the standard of devotion, no men of sense and reason will ever set themselves about it; but leave it to be understood by madmen, and practised by Fools.

The ut-  
most effect  
of this way  
is gross En-  
thusiasm.

Treat. I.

sect. 2. cap. I.

S. 6.

S. 7.

S. 12.

cap. 5. S. 10.

S. 15. But supposing this way were intel-  
ligible and Practicable, which it is not; yet  
what would the effect of it be, but the highest  
*Enthusiasm*? For the same Author lays it  
down, as a fundamental rule, *that God only, by  
his holy Inspirations, is the guide and director, in  
an Internal contemplative life; and that all the  
light they have therein, is from immediate divine  
illumination; as well as our strength from the di-  
vine operation: and that this light doth extend  
further and to more and other more particular  
objects, than the divine light or Grace, by which  
good Christians living common lives in the world  
are lead, extends to; yea than it does even in  
those, that seek perfection by the exercises of an  
active life.* But which is very extraordinary in  
this supernatural light, he saith *that generally  
when there is proposed the not doing or doing of  
an external work, and both of them are lawful,  
the divine inspiration moves to the not doing;*  
but this is not all, but among the impedim-  
ents to divine Inspirations he reckons, not  
only all external duties of Religion, but the doing  
things meerly for Edification. A most excel-  
lent and Apostolical doctrine! but it is happy  
for the Christian world, the Apostles had other  
kind of Inspirations from these: or else they  
had never done much good in the World, or  
been such eminent examples of holy life and  
actions. What becomes of all the precepts they  
have left us of doing good, of mutual edificati-  
on, of constant business, besides the commands  
for the outward duties of Worship, if these  
be the hinderances in the way to perfection?

And

And although he would not have his spiritual, internal liver to pretend to extraordinary apparitions, voices, conversations with spirits, message from Heaven, &c. Yet in his Discourse of *Pastive Unions*, he saith, that God reveals himself to the soul, by a supernatural species impressed in her; which revelations are either sensible as apparitions, words, &c. or intellectual, either immediately, or by Angels; the effects of which supernatural inactions of God are Raptus or Extasies, internal visions, &c. in which, he saith, that the less experienced and imperfect, are to advise with their director about them; but those who were more eminently perfect, have followed their own light in judging of those things and practising accordingly, without consulting others; and withall adds, that such souls which receive these things, must carefully observe her internal direction: and that they are not so absolutely obliged to resign their judgments and wills to others, as to neglect their own proper call received from God. And doth this doctrine now differ from that of the Fanatick Sectaries, which have swarmed in England? Yes. Mr. Cressy, in his Preface, undertakes at large to shew the difference: by answering the objection taken from thence, against the publishing this doctrine; because it would justify them, in all their frenzies and disorders: and in order to this; 1. He very foolishly goes about to prove the necessity of divine Inspirations, from the necessity of divine Grace, for the doing good actions; which is not denied by the greatest enemies to Enthusiasme. 2. He saith, we ought to correspond to those Divine

Seft 2.  
G. 1. S. 141

Treat. 3.  
Ch. 4. c. 3.  
S. 2.

S. 6.  
S. 36.

S. 37.

Cressy's  
Preface to  
Sancta Se-  
phia. S. 23.

S. 24.

Y

Inspira-

- S. 25. *Inspirations, which stir us up to good actions; if he means by them nothing but the assistance of Divine Grace, no one questions it.* 3. *That there may be false suggestions of the Devil, which may appear like the motions of Gods Spirit.*
- S. 276 4. *That, it being necessary these should be distinguished from each other, the only means imaginable, that can be proper, natural and efficacious to obtain such a supernatural light to discern Gods will in all things, is pure spiritual prayer exercised by a soul living an abstracted, internal, recollected life, spent in a continual attendance on God, &c. i. e. in short, the direction of F. Augustine Baker. And is not this, think we, a very cunning way of vindicating his doctrine from Fanaticism, to make Enthusiasm necessary to distinguish the motions of the good and bad Spirit in our minds? I have already shewed, that he teaches the highest Enthusiasm; and it seems, those who made the objection were sensible of it: But how doth Mr. Cressy answer it? by shewing what they condemn; to be necessary; and in effect, that no man can know the difference between the motions of the Holy Ghost and the Devil, but by Enthusiasme; nay, that is the plain meaning of his words, for this contemplative prayer, he saith, is the only means to gain such a supernatural light, whereby we can distinguish one from the other. An admirable way! to tell men they must first be mad, before they can know whether they be in their wits or no. But since this contemplative state, hath besides the common though immediate illuminations, many passive unions,*

or extraordinary revelations attending it; suppose the Question were put, how one should know whether these came from God, or the Devil, what answer will Mr. Cressy then give? will he return back again to try illuminations by inspirations (as he calls them) and so inspirations by illuminations, which is just like the Scripture by the Church, and Church by Scripture?

But here, saith Mr. Cressy, is no pretending to new or strange revelations, no walking in mirabilibus super se: yes I think he doth so, when he utters these things; for what are passive unions, but new revelations, and as great, as ever any Fanatick Sectary pretended to? Did not they deliver this for their Doctrine, that men ought to hearken to the immediate impulses of the Spirit of God within them; and that now, God doth acquaint his own people with his mind and will, in a way peculiar to themselves? And what have they done, of the mystical way, but only changed a few terms, and asserted the thing it self higher, than our Enthusiasts did; who did not boast of so many raptures, visions, and revelations, as those of the Church of Rome have done. Lud. Blosius, in his Works, hath one Book called *Monile Spirituale*; which consists of nothing, but the new and strange revelations which were made to four Women Saints, St. Gertrude, St. Mathildis, St. Brigitt, and St. Catharine; and in his Preface saith, it is a sign of a carnal mind, to despise such revelations as these are: for the Church of God is wonderfully enlightened by them. What, saith he, did not the Prophets

S. 29.

Lud. Blosii  
*Monile Spirituale*.  
p. 78.



and Apostles receive truth from Heaven by Revelations? As though the case were the very same in these melancholy Women, and in the holy Prophets and Apostles; and we had just as much reason to believe the effects of *historical vapours*, as of the *divine Spirit*. And lest we should imagine, these were only the *Fancies* of some women, which their Church would not be concerned for the credit of, he concludes with saying, *that these Revelations were known to the world and approved*. For those of *S. Brigitt*, we have before shewed how much they were approved; For *St. Gertrudes* he saith the same; and that one very learned and illuminate man did say, after the accurate reading of them, that man could not have the Spirit of God, who *Questioned whether those revelations came from it or no*. And therefore *Blossius* is so far from denying any new or strange revelations among them, that being a devout man, he prays God to pardon those, who questioned the authority of these revelations. But if no new revelations are allowed among them, what means that saying in the *spiritual exercises* of the *Jesuits*; p. 31, 32. of the Impression, *A. D. 1574*. It is the great perfection of a Christian, to keep himself indifferent, to do what God shall reveal to him; and not to determine himself to do, what he hath already revealed and taught in the Gospel. This is speaking to the purpose; and lest I should seem to charge any unjustly, (this passage not appearing in the latter impressions) it may be found in the *Moral practice* of the *Jesuits*, from the *Bishop of Malaga*. But the *Jesuits*

*Moral Practice of Jesuits. p. 379.*

are

are not so much Mr. Cressy's Friends, that he should be concerned in their *Vindication*: I can tell him therefore of a Friend of his, whom I am sure he is concerned for, that is for *new and strange revelations* too; and that is the *worthy publisher* of the *sixteen Revelations of Mother Juliana*: and if those be not *new and strange*, I think none ever ought to be accounted so.

But supposing they have *new and strange revelations* among them, yet Mr. Cressy saith, they are not *seditions and troublesome to the World*; no *dissolving unity*, or *crossing lawful authority* by them; because these are enjoyed in *solitude and retirements*, and supposing they be *mistaken*, no *harm would accrue to others* by it. As though persons were ever the less made for being chained, and having a *keeper* assigned them: such in effect do they make the office of a *confessor* to these *contemplatives*. The mischief to the world is not so great while they are kept up, but that to *Religion* is unsufferable; while they lead devout persons in such an unintelligible way, that the highest degree of their perfection is *Madness*. But I have already proved at large, that they have not been able in some cases, or willing in others, to keep up these *Enthusiastical* persons among them; but they have done as much to the disturbance of the peace, and been as unreclaimable among them, as ever any *Fanatick Sectaries* have done or been in *England*. And we are not to think, that the Principles of their *Church* are such quiet, meek and obedient things, that not a man

S. 33.

among them would ever lift up his finger to give any disturbance to the peace of a Nation: For,

Of their  
Fanaticism  
in resisting  
Authority  
under a  
pretence of  
Religion.

§. 16. I now come to prove, that they are as much guilty of the second sort of *Fanaticism* as any *Seſtaries* among us have been; which is the resisting authority, under a pretence of *Religion*. This I shall prove by two things. 1. That the Principles and Practices of the *Jesuitical* party in the *Roman Church*, are as destructive to *Government*, as of the most *Fanatick Seſtaries*, which ever have been among us. 2. That this party is the most countenanced, and encouraged by the *Court of Rome*.

1. That the Principles and Practices of the *Jesuitical* party in the *Roman Church* are as destructive to *Government*, as of the most *Fanatick Seſtaries* which ever have been among us: what effects of *Fanaticism* have we seen in *England* so dreadful, which may not be paralleled with examples, or justified by the principles of that party? Is it, that so many mens lives have been destroyed, under a pretence of *Religion*? and do they think the *Massacre at Paris*, and the *Rebellion in Ireland*, can ever be forgotten by us? Is it, that *Government* was supposed by them to be so originally in the people, that they by their representatives may call their *Sovereign* to an account, and alter the form of *Government*? This is the express doctrine of the *Jesuits*: for, saith *Bellarmin*, *Civil power is immediately in the people, as the immediate subject of it: and*

*Bellar. de  
Leyis, l. 3.  
c. 6.*

is indifferently transferred by them, either to one or many; and if they see cause they may change it as they see good, from a Monarchy to an Aristocratie or a Democratie. But because after the writing that Book, some persons had published a doctrine contrary to his; therefore, in the

Recognition.  
p. 56.

recognition of his works, he endeavours to strengthen what he had delivered, and produces a saying of Navarre, that the people never do transfer their power so far to the King, but they retain it habitually in themselves; and may in certain cases, resume it into their own hands. John Marianus, whose name will never be forgotten in these matters, determines the case plainly, That if there be no hope of a Princes amendment, the Common-wealth may take away his Kingdom; and because that cannot be done without War, they may raise Armies against him, and having proclaimed the King their publick enemy, may take away his life. Reynolds in his Book of the just abdication of Henry 3. of France, saith, that all the Majesty of the Kingdom is in the Assembly of the States, to whom it belongs to bridle the Kingly power, and to settle all things that belong to the publick Government. This is a doctrine fitted for such a season, wherein there is hopes to prevail upon a considerable party (as in the League in France) to do their business; but in case the States of the Kingdom be faithful to their Prince, they have easier ways of dispatch. And to this end, they declare it lawful for any person to take away the life of a Prince excommunicated by the Pope. But here their juggling and shuffling

Marian. de  
Regis Instit.  
l. 1. c. 6.

De justâ  
abdicatione  
H. 3. l. 3.  
c. 8.

Philippus  
c. editum.  
Ebrah.  
2. 1-9.

shew their meaning is not good; for they who mean honestly, are not afraid to speak plainly. If any one ask them, *Whether it be lawful to kill their Sovereign?* they will tell you by no means, and that none of them ever said so; but he being excommunicated they do not account him *their Sovereign*, and so they may lawfully do it. Nay it is avowed by some of them, *that it is a point of faith, to believe it is in the Popes power to depose Heretical Princes; and that subjects are, upon their being declared heretical, thereby absolved from all duty of obedience to them.* Nay, *that there needs no sentence of the Pope to be pronounced against him: and Mariana makes an intention of publick good, or, the advice of grave men sufficient; such as the Jesuits in France were to Clement, Chastel, and Ravaiillac, the first and last the actual Murderers of Henry 3. and Henry 4. and the second shewed his good intention when he stabbed Henry 4. in the mouth.* If any Priest or Fryer should attempt it, they have an excellent *salvo* for him, *that being a spiritual person (according to their doctrine of exemption) he is no Subject to the King.* If the Authority of the Council of Constance be objected by them, as the *doctrine of their Church*, against these Principles, they have withall given us an answer, that it meddles not with the case of *Sovereign Heretical Princes excommunicated by the Pope.* I need not produce the particular testimonies in this matter, of Bellarmin, Suarez, Valentia, Vasquez, with the herd of the Jesuitical order who follow these; having

having been produced by so many already, and particularly by the two worthy Authors of the *Answer to Philanax*, and the *Papists Apology*; from the latter of whom, we shortly expect a more accurate examination of these things: and by the former may appear, what influence the *Jesuitical party* had upon the most barbarous effects of *Fanaticism* here, in the Murther of a most excellent Prince. To whose observations I shall only add this, that A. D. 1648. a Book was Printed with this Title, *Several Speeches delivered at a Conference, concerning the Power of Parliament to proceed against their King for misgovernment*, licensed by *Gilb. Mabbot*; which is, word for word, taken out of *Parsons* the *Jesuits* Book of succession to the *Crown of England* (purposely designed against our *Kings* title) as will appear to any one, who will take the pains to compare them. By which we may see to whom our *Fanaticks* owed their principles, and their precedents; and how much *Father Parsons* (though at that distance) contributed to the cutting off the *Kings* Head. But it may be now they have changed their principles, and renounced all these *Doctrines*; we should like them so much the better, if they once did this freely and sincerely; and not with sly tricks and equivocations, which they use in these matters, whenever they are pinched with them. Let them, without *mental reservations*, declare but these two points; that *the Pope cannot absolve the Kings Subjects, from the Oath of Allegiance they make to him*; and, that though the *Pope* should

*Ans. to Philan.*

*chap. 5.*

*p. 111.*

*Ans. to*

*Apology.*

*p. 6.*

*Ans. to*

*Philan. p.*

*53. to 65.*



*Remonstr.*

*Hibernor.*

*p. 1. ca 4.*

*S. 2.*

*Remonstr.*

*Hib. p. 1. c. 2.*

*art. 2. 3.*

should excommunicate the King as a Heretick, and raise Warr against him, they are bound to defend the King against the Pope; and by the owning these two Propositions, they will gain more upon our belief of their fidelity, than the large Volume in vindication of the *Irish Remonstrances* hath done; For there they falter, in the very entrance; for being charged from Rome, that by their Remonstrance they had fallen under the condemnation of the Bull of Paul 5. against the Oath of Allegiance, they give these three Answers which ought to be considered by us. 1. That in the Oath of Allegiance they swear and testifie in their Consciences before God and the World, that King Charles is their lawful King, and that the Pope hath no power to depose, &c. Whereas they only acknowledge it. 2. That in the Oath of Allegiance, the contrary opinion is condemned, which is not in theirs. 3. That in the Oath of Allegiance, they declare that they believe that the Pope cannot dispense with that Oath, or any part of it; but this is omitted by them: and surely not without reason on their parts, but with little satisfaction on ours. And it is easie to observe, that this Remonstrance was grounded upon this, that the Pope owned our King to be lawful King of England (a great kindness.) and this being supposed, all the rest follows naturally, as they well prove against the *Divines of Louvain*; but suppose it should come into his Holiness's head, to be of another opinion, we see no assurance but they will be so too. And it may make the Pope more cautious for the future, how he declares himself, when such ill

use

use is made of it; and others, how they rely upon such *Remonstrances*, which have still a tacit reservation of the *Popes* power to declare and dispense. But will they declare it unlawful to resist Authority, when the cause of their Church is concerned; and supposing that thereby they can settle the *Pope* in the full exercise of his spiritual Authority among us? No, this is their *Good old Cause*, that undermines *Parliaments*, that *Sanctifies* Rebellion, and turns *Nuptials* into *Massacres*. This is that which changes *blood* into *Holy Water*, and dying for *Treason* into *Martyrdom*; this is that which gives the glory at *Rome* to *Regicides*, and makes the Pictures of *Gueret*, *Guignard* and *Garnet*, so much valued there; of which we have a sufficient testimony, from *Mons. S. Amour*; who tells us, that among the several *Pourtraicts* of *Jesuits*, publicly sold there with permission of the Superior, he saw one of *Garnet*, with this Inscription, *Pater Henricus Garnetus Anglus, Londini pro fide Catholica suspensus & sectus 3 Maii 1606*. Father *Henry Garnet*, hanged and quartered at *London*, for the *Catholick Faith*: by which we see, that *Treason* and the *Catholick faith* are all one at *Rome*; for nothing can be more notorious, than that *Garnet* suffered only on the account of the *Gunpowder-Treason*; of which as *M. S. Amour* observes, he acknowledged himself guilty before he dyed. The most dangerous Sect among us, is of those who under pretence of setting up the *Kingdom of Christ*, think it lawful to overturn the *Kingdoms* of the *World*. But herein

*Caron. p. 1.*  
*c. 5. S. 24.*  
*p. 25.*

*S. Amour's*  
*Journal*  
*part. 2. ch.*  
*11. p. 58.*

herein they have mightily the advantage of those of the *Church of Rome*, that what they do for *Christ*, the other do it only for his *Vicar*: and surely if either were lawful, it is much fitter to do it for one, than for the other. We are of opinion, that it is somewhat better being under *Christs* own Government, than the *Popes*, whatever they think, but we condemn any *opposition to Government*, under any pretence whatsoever, and though *Venner* and his company acted to the height of *Fanaticism*, among our *Sectaries*; yet *Guido Faux* with his companions in their Church, went beyond them.

2. That party which hath been most destructive to *Civil Government*, hath had the most countenance and encouragement from *Rome*. Of which I shall give but two instances, but sufficient to prove the thing, *A. D. 1594. 27. of December*; *John Castel* a Citizens Son of *Paris*: and disciple of the *Jesuits*, having been three years in the School, watched his opportunity to stab *Henry 4.* but by his stooping, just at the time of the blow, he struck him only into the mouth; upon which the *Jesuits* were banished *France*, and a *Pyramid* erected in the place of his *Fathers* house; in the Front whereof towards the *Palace gate*, the *Arrest* of the *Court of Parliament* against the *Traytor* was engraven, containing his examination and confession, of being a *Scholler* of the *Jesuits*, a *Disciple* of *Guerets*; and the sentence passed upon him because he believed it lawful to *Kill Kings*, that *Henry 4.* was not in the *Church*, till he

was

was approved by the Pope, &c. This Arrest continued without notice taken of it at Rome, till October 9. A. D. 1609. and on that day, it was condemned by the Order of the Inquisition, and put into the *Index Expurgatorius*, as *Index. Expurg. Alex.* it is at this day to be seen. Which was a time wherein many reports were fled abroad in many parts of the Murther of Henry 4. and Letters came to Paris from several places, to know the truth of it, and the consequence of this was, that it being found how careful the Court of Rome was to preserve the honor of *Rigicides*, it was but seven months and twenty four days, before *Ravaillac* perfected that work which the other had begun. This observation I owe to an ingenuous and learned Doctor of the Sorbon, yet living; who detests these practices and Doctrines, and himself lies under the same censure there. And the more to abuse the world, on the same day, a Book of *Mariana's* was suspended; which those, who look no farther than the name, might imagine was the dangerous Book, so much complained of; but upon search it appears, to be a Book quite of another nature, concerning *Coyne*.

*Joh Lauoy*  
*Epistol. p. v.*  
*6. pag. 358.*

The latter instance concerns the *Irish Remonstrance*, the account of which I take from Caron the publisher of it. The Popish Clergy of Ireland (a very few excepted) were accused of Rebellion, for opposing themselves to the Kings Authority, by the instigation of the Popes Nuncio; after which followed a meeting of the Popish Bishops, where they banished the Kings

*Remonstr.*  
*Hib. p. 1.*  
*c. 5 p. 27.*

Litue-

*Lieutenant*, and took the Royal Authority upon themselves ; almost all the *Clergy*, and a great part of the people joyned with them : and therefore it was necessary, since the *Kings* return, to give him better satisfaction concerning their *Allegiance* ; and to decline the *Oath of Allegiance* , which they must otherwise have taken, some of them agree upon this *Remonstrance* to present to the *King* , the news of which was no sooner come to *Rome*, but *Cardinal Barberin* sends a Letter to the *Irish Nobility* 8 July A. D. 1662. to bid them take heed , of being drawn into the ditch by those blind guides, who had subscribed to some propositions testifying their Loyalty to the *King* , which had been before condemned by the *Apostolick See*. After this the *Popes Nuncio* at *Brussels*, July 21. 1662. sends them word, how displeasing their *Remonstrance* was at *Rome*; and that after diligent examination by the *Cardinals* and *Divines* , they found it contained Propositions already condemned by *Paul 5.* and *Innocent 10.* and therefore the *Pope* gave him order, to publish this among them ; that he was so far from approving their *Remonstrance*; that he did not so much as permit it, or connive at it, and was extremely grieved that the *Irish Nobility* were drawn into it, and therefore condemned it in this form, That it could not be kept without breach of faith, according to the Decree of *Paul 5.* and that it denyed the *Popes Authority* in matters of faith, according to that of *Innocent 10.* By this very late instance we see, what little countenance they receive from *Rome*, who offer to give any reasonable security to the *King* of their Loyalty ;

cap. 3. p. 6.

*Loyalty*; and by the *Popes* own Declaration, the giving of it is an injury to the *faith*, and a denying his *Supremacie*. For which we are to understand that *A. D.* 1648. when the *Papists* were willing to make as good terms for themselves as they could, and it was objected to them, that they held Principles inconsistent with Civil Government, viz. That the *Pope* can absolve them from their obedience; that he can depose & destroy heretical Magistrates; that he can dispense with all Oaths and Contracts they make with those whom they call Hereticks; upon this they met together, and to save themselves from banishment resolved them in the Negative; but no sooner was this heard at Rome, but the *Sacred Congregation* condemned this resolution, as Heretical, and the Subscribers, as liable to the penalties against those who deny the *Popes* Authority in matters of Faith; upon which they are cited to appear at Rome, and Censures and Prisons are there prepared for them. The sum of it then is, that they can give no security of their Loyalty to the King, against the *Popes* power to depose him, and absolve his Subjects from whatever Oaths they make to him; or they must be accounted Hereticks at Rome for so doing. For this *Good Old Cause* is as much still in request at Rome, as ever: and it is in their power to be accounted Hereticks at Rome, or bad Subjects in their own Country; but one of them they cannot avoid. So much may suffice to shew, that the most dangerous Principles of Fanaticism, either as to Enthusiasm or Civil Government, are owned and allowed



allowed in the *Church of Rome* : And therefore the number of *Fanatics* , among us , is very unjustly charged upon the reading the *Scriptures* in our own Language. For I hope I have made it evident, by this Discourse , that those who read not the *Scriptures* may be as *Fanatical* and *disloyal*, as those that do : And to say that *Seëts and Fanaticisms* are the dire effects of the *promiscuous reading of the Scriptures*, is in effect to say , that the *Scripture* is a pestilent Book, which God had better have kept to himself, and good for nothing but to confound the World ; and that the only way to hinder the mischiefs which it is apt to produce, is (follow his own comparifon ) to keep it out of the peoples way , as men do knives and swords from their children.

---

CHAP.

## CHAP. V.

*Of the Divisions of the Roman Church.*

The great pretence of *Unity in the Church of Rome considered. The Popes Authority the fountain of that Unity; what that Authority is which is challenged by the Popes over the Christian World; the disturbances which have happened therein, on the account of it. The first revolt of Rome from the Empire, caused by the Popes; Baronius his Arguments answered. Rebellion the foundation of the greatness of that Church. The cause of the strict League between the Popes and the posterity of Charles Martel. The disturbances made by Popes, in the new Empire: Of the quarrels of Greg. 7. with the Emperour and other Christian Princes, upon the pretence of the Popes Authority. More disturbances on that account in Christendom, than any other matter of Religion. Of the Schisms which have happened in the Roman Church: particularly those after the time of Formosus, wherein his Ordinations were nulled by his Successors; the Popes opposition to each other in that*

*Age: the miserable state of that Church then described, Of the Schisms of latter times, by the Italic and Gallick factions; the long continuance of them. The mischief of those Schisms, on their own principles. Of the divisions in that Church about matters of Order and Government. The differences between the Bishops and the Monastick Orders, about exemptions and privileges; the history of that Controversie, and the bad success the Popes had in attempting to compose it. Of the quarrel between the Regulars and Seculars in England. The continuance of that Controversie here, and in France. The Jesuits enmity to the Episcopal Order and Jurisdiction: the hard case of the Bishop of Angelopolis in America. The Popes still favour the Regulars, as much as they dare. The Jesuits way of converting the Chinese, discovered by that Bishop. Of the differences in matters of Doctrines in that Church. They have no better way to compose them than we. The Popes Authority never truly ended one Controversie among them. Their ways to evade the decisions of Popes and Councils. Their dissensions are about matters of Faith. The ways taken to excuse their own differences will take away the differences between them and us, manifested by Sancta Clara's Exposition of the 39 Articles. Their disputes not confined to their Schools, proved, by a particular instance, about the immaculate conception; the infinite scandals, confessed by their own Authors, to have been in their Church about it.*

From

From all which it appears, that the Church of Rome can have no advantage, in point of Unity, above ours.

2. §. 1. **T**HE other thing objected, as flowing from the promiscuous reading the Scriptures, is, *the number of our Sects, and the disturbances which have been among us upon their account*: whereas among them, the Government of the Church is so ordered, as to keep all in peace and Unity. This makes it necessary, to examine that admirable Unity they boast so much of, and either they mean by it, that there hath been less disturbance in the world before the Reformation, or no Schisms among themselves, or no differences in the matters of Religion. But I shall now prove:

1. That there have never been greater disturbances in the world, than upon the account of that Authority of the Pope, which they look on as the Foundation of their Unity.
2. That there have happened great and scandalous Schisms among themselves, on the same account.
3. That their differences in Religion, both as to matter of Order, and Doctrine, have been as great, and managed with as much animosity, as any among us.

Of the great presence of Unity, in the Church of Rome.

1. The disturbances in the world upon the account of the Popes Authority: I meddle not barely with his Usurpations (which work is lately and largely done) but the effects of them in these Western Churches. For which we are to consider, what Authority that is which the Pope challenges; and what

History of Romish Usurpations by Hen Foulis.

*Lieutenants*, and took the Royal Authority upon themselves; almost all the *Clergy*, and a great part of the people joyned with them: and therefore it was necessary, since the *Kings* return, to give him better satisfaction concerning their *Allegiance*; and to decline the *Oath of Allegiance*, which they must otherwise have taken, some of them agree upon this *Remonstrance* to present to the *King*, the news of which was no sooner come to *Rome*, but *Cardinal Barberin* sends a Letter to the *Irish Nobility* 8 July A. D. 1662. to bid them take heed, of being drawn into the ditch by those blind guides, who had subscribed to some propositions testifying their Loyalty to the *King*, which had been before condemned by the *Apostolick See*. After this the *Popes Nuncio* at *Brussels*, July 21. 1662. sends them word, how displeasing their *Remonstrance* was at *Rome*; and that after diligent examination by the *Cardinals* and *Divines*, they found it contained Propositions already condemned by *Paul 5.* and *Innocent 10.* and therefore the *Pope* gave him order, to publish this among them; that he was so far from approving their *Remonstrance*, that he did not so much as permit it, or connive at it, and was extremely grieved that the *Irish Nobility* were drawn into it, and therefore condemned it in this form, That it could not be kept without breach of faith, according to the Decree of *Paul 5.* and that it denied the *Popes Authority* in matters of faith, according to that of *Innocent 10.* By this very late instance we see, what little countenance they receive from *Rome*, who offer to give any reasonable security to the *King* of their

Loyalty;

cap. 3. p. 6.

Loyalty; and by the *Popes* own Declaration, the giving of it is an injury to the *faith*, and a denying his *Supremacie*. For which we are to understand that *A. D.* 1648. when the *Papists* were willing to make as good terms for themselves as they could, and it was objected to them, that they held Principles inconsistent with Civil Government, *viz.* That the *Pope* can absolve them from their obedience; that he can depose & destroy heretical Magistrates; that he can dispense with all Oaths and Contracts they make with those whom they call Hereticks; upon this they met together, and to save themselves from banishment resolved them in the Negative; but no sooner was this heard at *Rome*, but the *Sacred Congregation* condemned this resolution, as Heretical, and the Subscribers, as liable to the penalties against those who deny the *Popes* Authority in matters of Faith; upon which they are cited to appear at *Rome*, and Censures and Prisons are there prepared for them. The sum of it then is, that they can give no security of their Loyalty to the *King*, against the *Popes* power to depose him, and absolve his Subjects from whatever Oaths they make to him; or they must be accounted Hereticks at *Rome* for so doing. For this *Good Old Cause* is as much still in request at *Rome*, as ever: and it is in their power to be accounted Hereticks at *Rome*, or bad Subjects in their own Country; but one of them they cannot avoid. So much may suffice to shew, that the most dangerous Principles of Fanaticism, either as to Enthusiasm or Civil Government, are owned and allowed



allowed in the *Church of Rome* : And therefore the number of *Fanaticks* , among us , is very unjustly charged upon the reading the *Scriptures* in our own Language. For I hope I have made it evident, by this Discourse , that those who read not the *Scriptures* may be as *Fanatical* and *disloyal*, as those that do : And to say that *Seëts and Fanaticisms are the dire effects of the promiscuous reading of the Scriptures*, is in effect to say , that the *Scripture* is a pestilent Book, which God had better have kept to himself, and good for nothing but to confound the World ; and that the only way to hinder the mischiefs which it is apt to produce, is (follow his own comparifon ) to keep it out of the peoples way , as men do knives and swords from their children.

---

CHAP.

## CHAP. V.

*Of the Divisions of the Roman Church.*

The great pretence of Unity in the Church of Rome considered. The Popes Authority the fountain of that Unity; what that Authority is which is challenged by the Popes over the Christian World; the disturbances which have happened therein, on the account of it. The first revolt of Rome from the Empire, caused by the Popes; Baronius his Arguments answered. Rebellion the foundation of the greatness of that Church. The cause of the strict League between the Popes and the posterity of Charles Martel. The disturbances made by Popes, in the new Empire: Of the quarrels of Greg. 7. with the Emperour and other Christian Princes, upon the pretence of the Popes Authority. More disturbances on that account in Christendom, than any other matter of Religion. Of the Schisms which have happened in the Roman Church: particularly those after the time of Formosus, wherein his Ordinations were nulled by his Successors; the Popes opposition to each other in that

*Age : the miserable state of that Church then described, Of the Schisms of latter times, by the Italick and Gallick factions ; the long continuance of them. The mischief of those Schisms, on their own principles. Of the divisions in that Church about matters of Order and Government. The differences between the Bishops and the Monastick Orders, about exemptions and priviledges ; the history of that Controversie, and the bad success the Popes had in attempting to compose it. Of the quarrel between the Regulars and Seculars in England. The continuance of that Controversie here, and in France. The Jesuits enmity to the Episcopal Order and Jurisdiction : the hard case of the Bishop of Angelopolis in America. The Popes still favour the Regulars, as much as they dare. The Jesuits way of converting the Chinese, discovered by that Bishop. Of the differences in matters of Doctrines in that Church. They have no better way to compose them than we. The Popes Authority never truly ended one Controversie among them. Their ways to evade the decisions of Popes and Councils. Their dissensions are about matters of Faith. The ways taken to excuse their own differences will take away the differences between them and us, manifested by Sancta Clara's Exposition of the 39 Articles. Their disputes not confined to their Schools, proved, by a particular instance, about the immaculate conception ; the infinite scandals, confessed by their own Authors, to have been in their Church about it.*

*From*

From all which it appears, that the Church of Rome can have no advantage, in point of Unity, above ours.

2. §. 1. **T**HE other thing objected, as flowing from the promiscuous reading the Scriptures, is, *the number of our Sects, and the disturbances which have been among us upon their account*: whereas among them, the Government of the Church is so ordered, as to keep all in peace and Unity. This makes it necessary, to examine that admirable Unity they boast so much of, and either they mean by it, that there hath been less disturbance in the world before the Reformation, or no Schisms among themselves, or no differences in the matters of Religion. But I shall now prove:

1. That there have never been greater disturbances in the world, than upon the account of that Authority of the Pope, which they look on as the Foundation of their Unity.
2. That there have happened great and scandalous Schisms among themselves, on the same account.
3. That their differences in Religion, both as to matter of Order, and Doctrine, have been as great, and managed with as much animosity, as any among us.

Of the great presence of Unity, in the Church of Rome.

History of Romish Usurpations by Hen Foulis.

1. The disturbances in the world upon the account of the Popes Authority: I meddle not barely with his Usurpations (which work is lately and largely done) but the effects of them in these Western Churches. For which we are to consider, what Authority that is which the Pope challenges; and what

disturbances hath been given to the peace of *Christendom* by it. The *Authority* claimed by the *Pope*, is that of being *Universal Pastor* over the *Catholick Church*, by vertue of which not only spiritual direction in matters of faith, but an actual jurisdiction over all the members of it, doth belong unto him. "For otherwise, "they say, the Government of the *Church* is "imperfect, and insufficient for its end; because Princes may easily overthrow the Unity "of the Church, by favouring Hereticks, if "they be not in subjection to the *Pope*, as to "their temporal concerns; because it may "happen that they have a regard to no other, "but these; if it were not therefore in the "Popes power, to depose *Princes*, and absolve "Subjects from their Allegiance, when they "oppose the *Unity* of the *Church*, his power, say "they, is an insignificant title, and cannot reach "the end it was designed for. Besides, they "urge, that all Princes coming into the Church, "are to be supposed to submit their Scepters to "Christ, so as to lose them in case they act contrary to the *Catholick Church*, of which they "are made members; for *whosoever doth not* "bete Father and Mother, &c. cannot be my Disciple. And what Officer is there so fit, to take all *Escheats* and *Forfeitures* of Power, as Christ's own Vicar upon Earth? But to add more strength, *Bellarmin* very prettily proves it out of *Pasce oves*, "for every Pastor must have a "threefold power to defend his flock; a power "over Wolves, to keep them from destroying "the Sheep; a power over the Rams, that they do

“do not hurt them; and a power over the  
 “Sheep, to give them convenient food: Now,  
 “saith he, *very subtilly*, if a Prince of a sheep  
 “should turn a Ram or a Wolf, must not he  
 “have power to drive him away, and to keep  
 “the people from following him? This is then  
 the only current doctrine concerning the *Popes*  
 Authority, in the *Court of Rome*, and although  
 some mince the matter, more than others do,  
 and talk only of an *indirect power*; yet they all  
 mean the same thing, and ascribe such power to  
 the *Pope*, whereby he may *depose* Princes,  
 and absolve subjects from the duty they owe to  
 them. And how much in request this Do-  
 ctine continues at *Rome*, appears by the Coun-  
 sel given by *Michael Lonig*, Master of the Pa-  
 lace, to *Pope Greg. 15.* Printed *A. D. 1623.*  
 about perswading the *Duke of Bavaria*, then  
 newly made *Elect*or, to receive a confirmation  
 of his title from the *Pope*; “to which end,  
 “he saith, some skilful person ought to be im-  
 “ployed to acquaint him, that the power of  
 “the Empire was the meer issue of the  
 “Church, and did spring from it as a Child from  
 “the Mother; and that it was a great sin for  
 “any *Christian* to call this into Question;  
 “and consequently, the *Popes* power and au-  
 “thority to determine concerning the state and  
 “affairs of the *Empire*; and this he attempts  
 “to prove, by no fewer than nineteen argu-  
 “ments, all of them drawn from the former  
 “Usurpations of the *Popes*, and encroachments  
 “upon the Empire: from whence he concludes,  
 “that the *Elect*orship could not be lawfully  
 “taken

*Consilium*  
*Greg. 15.*  
*exhibitum*  
*per Mich.*  
*Lonig.*  
*A. D. 1623.*



*Aphorismi  
de statu  
Ecclesie re-  
staurando  
per Mich.  
Lonigum.*

“ taken away from one , and given to another,  
“ without the *Popes* consent and Authority ;  
“ and that such a disposal of it was in it self  
“ null; and of no force. The same year, came  
forth a Book of *Aphorisms* concerning the re-  
storing the state of the Church, by the decree  
and approbation of the *Colledge* of *Cardinals*,  
collected by the same person, and by him pre-  
sented to the *Pope*; wherein the same power of  
the *Pope* is asserted, and that it belongs to him  
to transfer the Electoral dignity from one to  
another ; and that it ought to be taken away  
from the *Electors* of *Saxony*, and *Brandenburg*,  
for opposing his Authority ; and that to allow  
the *Emperor* authority in these things, was to  
rob the *Apostolick* See of its due rights. By  
which we may understand, what that Autho-  
rity over the Church is which is challenged by  
the *Pope* as supream Pastor, in order to the  
preserving the Unity of it.

Of the di-  
sturbances  
of the  
Christian  
World, un-  
der the  
pretence of  
the *Popes*  
Authority.

§. 2. We now consider, what the blessed ef-  
fects of this pretended power hath been in the  
Christian World : and I doubt not to make it  
appear, that this very thing hath caused more  
wars and bloodshed, more confusions and dis-  
orders, more revolts and rebellions in *Christen-*  
*dom*, than all other causes put together have  
done, since the time it was first challenged ;  
and this I shall prove, from their own Au-  
thors ; and such, whose credit is the greatest  
among them. The revolt of *Rome*, and the ad-  
jacent parts, from the subjection due to the *Ro-*  
*man Emperor*, then resident at *Constantinople*,  
was wholly caused by the *Pope*. The first *Pope*,  
saith

saith *Onuphrius*, that ever durst openly resist the Emperour was *Constantine I.* who opposed *Philippicus* in the matter of *Images*, which the Emperour commanded to be pulled down, because they were abused to *Idolatry*, and the Pope utterly refused to obey; and not only so, but set up more in opposition to him, in the *Pertico* of *St. Peter*; and forbad the use of the Emperours name and title, in any publick Writings or Coyns. The same command was not long after renewed by *Leo 3.* upon which, saith *Onuphrius*, *Gregory 2.* then Pope, took away the small remainder of the *Roman Empire* from him in *Italy*; and *Sigonius* more expressly, that he not only excommunicated the Emperour, but absolved all the people of *Italy* from their Allegiance, and forbad the payment of any Tribute to him; whereupon the Inhabitants of *Rome*, *Campania*, *Ravenna*, and *Pentapolis*, i. e. the Region about *Ancona*, immediately rebelled, and rose up in opposition to their Magistrates, whom they destroyed. At *Ravenna*, *Paulus* the Emperours Lieutenant or Exarch was killed; at *Rome*, *Peter* the Governor had his eyes put out; in *Campania*, *Exhilaratus* and his Son *Hadrian* were both murdered by the people of *Rome*; and not content with this, he writ a Letter to the Emperour, full of the greatest reproaches imaginable. *Baronius* is very hard put to it, to vindicate the Pope; for he confesses, the Rebellion of the people was occasioned by the Popes opposing the Emperour, and commends their zeal for Religion in it, and acknowledgeth that the Emperour laid all the blame on the Pope, and that the Greek

*Onuphr.*  
*Annot. in*  
*Platin. vit.*  
*Constant.*

*Sigonius*  
*de regno*  
*Ital. l. 3.*  
*A. D. 726.*  
*Naucler.*  
*Chronon.*  
*Gen. 25.*

*Baron. Ann-*  
*ales Eccl.*  
*A. 726.*  
*tom. 9.*

Historians, *Theophanes* and *Zonaras* do so too; but all this, he saith, proceedeth only from their spight against the Roman Church, and their ignorance of affairs in it; but if we believe him, the Pope rather endeavoured to keep them in obedience to the Emperour; and when they would have chosen another, he opposed it: which he proves from *Paulus Diaconus*, and *Anastasius*. But what is that to the business? the question is not, Whether the Pope did not hinder the choosing another Emperour, but whether he did not draw the people off from their obedience to the Emperour that then was? And this is not only affirmed by the *Greek Historians*, but by those of the Roman Church. *Sigebert* saith, that *Gregory 2.* finding the Emperour incorrigible, he made Rome, Italy, and all the West to revolt from him, and forbade his Tributes: the same is affirmed by *Otto Frisingensis*, *Conradus Urspergensis*, *Hieronymus Rubens*, and others, who cannot be suspected of any enmity to the Roman Church. As for the making a new Emperour, therein the Pope had another game to play; he was not willing the Souldierſhould make another Emperour: for as *Hadr. Valer. Valesius* well observes, the Pope durst not so affront the Emperour, if he had not held a private correspondencie with *Charles Martel* at that time, whose Honour and Arms were the greatest in these Western parts. Having thereby strengthened his interest against both the Emperour his known enemy, and the *Lombards* that were at best but unfaithful friends, he makes what advantage he can

*Chronicon.*  
*Sigeberti* ad  
A. 728.

*Otto Fri-*  
*ſon* . l. 5.  
c. 18.

*Uſſergerſ*  
*Chron.* ad  
A. 718.

*Hier. Rubi*  
*biſſov. Ra-*  
*ven.* l. 4.

p. 190.

*Hadr. Va-*  
*leſ. Rerum*  
*Francic.* lib.

25. tom 3.

p. 520.

can of the places that owed subjection to the  
*Emperour*, to make up the *Patrimony* of the  
*Church*: as *Valesius* observes particularly, of  
*Sutrium*; but *Sigonius* saith, the people not only  
 cast off the *Emperour*, but did swear to be faithful  
 to the *Pope*, (no wonder then he was not  
 willing to have a new *Emperour* chosen) so that  
 at this time *Rome*, and the *Roman Dutchy* came  
 into the hands of the *Pope*, the *Cities* of which  
 are enumerated by *Sigonius*; and therefore *Pa-*  
*pirius Massonus* deservedly makes this *Pope*, the  
 founder of the greatness of the *Roman Church*:  
 which we see was laid in downright rebellion:  
 and can be no otherwise justified, than by ma-  
 king the *Pope* absolute *Governour* of the *World*.  
 Not long after the *Pope* begins, saith *Valesius*,  
 a War with the *Lombards*, who watched any  
 occasion to take away some part of his newly  
 gotten *Patrimony*; he therefore sends away  
*Anastafius* and *Sergius* into *France* to *Charles*  
*Martel*, with the *Keys* of *St. Peters Sepulchre*,  
 in token of their owning him as their *Protector*.  
 Which *Embassie* being acceptable to *Charles*,  
 he procures a peace to be concluded between  
 the *Lombards* and the *Romans*: which was  
 contrary to the *Popes* desire, who sent several  
 Letters and Messengers to him to come into  
*Italy*, to revenge *St. Peters* quarrel against the  
*Lombards* with *Fire and Sword*; and as he  
 loved *St. Peter*, he would come with all Speed  
 into *Italy*; as appears by the Letters still extant  
 and published by *Sirmondus*. But he soon after  
 dying, his son *Pepin* succeeding in all his power;  
 and growing weary of having so much as the  
 name

*Sigon. de*  
*regno Ital.*  
*l. 3. ad*  
*A. D. 727.*

*Papir. Mas-*  
*sonus de*  
*Episcop.*  
*urbis l. 3.*  
*p. 126.*

*Vales. tom.*  
*3 p. 525.*

*Platina in*  
*Grego. 3.*

*Sirmondi*  
*Council Gal-*  
*lic. Tom. 1.*  
*p. 526.*

Otto, Fri-  
sing Chron.  
l. 5. c. 22.  
Papir. Ma-  
son. Annal.  
Fraz. l. 2.  
p. 86.  
Sabellic.  
Enead. 8.  
l. 8.  
Blond. de-  
cad. 1. lib. 10

Concilior  
Antiq. Gal-  
licæ suppl-  
ment p. 78.  
A. D. 756.

name of a *King* above him, sends to *Pope Zachary* to know whether it were not fitter for him to bear the name, who did all the business of a *King*; he very well understood his meaning, and readily assented to it; upon which *Chilperick* was deposed and put into a *Monastery*, and *Pepin* was afterwards absolved by the *Pope* from his Oath of fidelity, with all the Nobles and People. There being now so close a League between the *Popes* interest and *Pepin*s; the ones title to his Crown depending on the *Popes* authority, the others security upon his protection, no wonder to see them endeavor the promoting each others advantage. The *Popes* Territories being not long after molested by *Aistulphus* King of the *Lombards*, *Stephen* writes a very pitiful Letter of complaint to *Pepin*, and *Charles* and *Charlemagne* his Sons; wherein he saith, that *Aistulphus* had almost broke his heart with grief because he would not leave one foot of Land to *St. Peter* and the *Holy Church*; and therefore he conjures them by *St. Peter*, who had anointed them *Kings*, that they would recover the lands again out of the *Lombards* hands; or otherwise they may think what a sad account they will give to *St. Peter* in the day of Judgment: These are the words of the *Popes* letter, lately published by *Delaland Sirmondus* his Nephew, in his *Supplement* of the *Gallican Councils*. Upon this, *Pepin* comes to his assistance, and every peace adds still more to the *Churches* Revenue; by which it was now grown very considerable by the spoils of the *Empire*, the *Exarchat* of *Ravenna* in *Pope Stephens* time being

being destroyed, which was the only remainder then left of the *Empire in Italy*: and the revenues of it were given by *Pepin* to the Church of *Rome*: as appears by an ancient inscription in *Ravenna*, mentioned by *Papirius Massenus*: Which the *Pope* solicited hard for, when he went himself into *France* on purpose to stir up *Pepin* against the *Lombards*, and was much afraid lest the *Exarchat* should have been restored again to the *Emperour*; but *Pepin* promising to give the *Region of Pentapolis*, and *Ravenna*, to the *Roman See* (as soon as he had taken them from the *Lombards*) the *Pope* went away well satisfied: and drew after him a mighty Army, whereby a great part of *Italy* was laid waste, and the people miserably harrassed; for no other end, but to secure that to the *Pope*, which did by all right belong to the *Emperour*: Who sent *Ambassadors*, first to the *Pope*, and then to *Pepin* to desire the restitution of those places to their true owner; but the *Pope* denied, and *Pepin* urged the promise he had already made to the *Pope*, and that he could not go back from it; because he undertook that quarrel meerly for his souls, and the *Popes* sake, without expecting any advantage to himself by it. *Aistulphus* being dead, *Desiderius* takes upon him the *Kingdom of Lombardy*, but he fearing *Rachis* the right heir, makes a League presently with the *Pope*; and by surrendring up some more *Cities*, makes him wholly of his party, and *Rachis* is fain to retire again to a *Monastery*: but after a while, *Desiderius* finds an occasion to quarrel with the *Pope*, and takes several *Cities* into his hands which

*Papir. Mass-*  
*son. Annales*  
*Franc. l. 2.*  
*p. 87.*  
*Sigon. de*  
*reg. Ital. 3*  
*A. 754.*  
*Sirmoud.*  
*Concil. Tom.*  
*2. p. 12.*

*Blond. de-*  
*cad. 2. l. 1.*

*Platin. in*  
*Steph. 2.*

*Adelnus in*  
*Franc. Ar-*  
*nal. ad A.*  
*755.*  
*Blondus ib.*  
*Platina in.*  
*Stephan. 2.*



which the Pope had got possession of, and threatens suddenly to besiege Rome; Pope Adrian, finding himself in these straights, dispatches away messengers with all speed to Charles the Son of Pepin, that he would imitate his Father, and Grandfather, in relieving the Church of Rome in this distress. Charles, not willing to omit such an opportunity of enlarging his Dominions, enters Italy with a great Army; and in a little time puts a period to the Kingdom of Lombardy, which had then lasted in Italy 206 years; and was magnificently received at Rome, by Hadrian and the people; by whom he was chosen Protector of the Roman Church and state, under the name of *Patritius*; and he being desired by Hadrian, to confirm his Fathers Promises to the Church, not only doth that, but adds a considerable accession, the more firmly to oblige the Romans, and especially the Pope to him. Italy being thus reduced, nothing was now wanting to Charles but the Title of *Emperour*; having already so great a dominion in Italy, besides what he had in Germany and France. This had been often treated on between the Pope and him, but the seditions of Rome by the Emperours party frequently happening by the presence of some of his Officers there, as Platina confesseth, and his party being not inconsiderable in other parts, though not daring publicly to appear, and Charles by his Warrs being elsewhere employed, this was put off till Pope Leo 3. by the conspiracy of some of the chief Citizens of Rome, was seized on and imprisoned; from whence making

Platina in  
Stephan. 3.

making a difficult escape, he goes in haste to Charles, who coming into Italy and punishing the conspiratours, the Pope then, (some say, by his own Authority, of which number, Bellarmin reckons thirty three Authors, others by the consent of the Senate and people) declares Charles to be Emperour of Rome, and solemnly performs the office of his Inauguration. Thus we have seen the Foundation laid, of the Greatness of the Roman Church; which being begun in Rebellion, was carryed on by continual wars, and so great devastations of the Country, that Platina and Blondus both say, that the Country about Rome, suffered more in that time, than in all the invasions of the barbarous Nations for 344. years before. And was not the Church like to enjoy much happiness and peace, under a Government founded in Rebellion, and maintained by blood? for we see the Popes were the great instruments of casting off their lawful Prince, and taking his Territories to themselves; and to maintain what they had unjustly gotten, they never scrupled beginning quarrels, making wars, calling in any foreign assistance, that might the most serve to promote their designs.

§. 3. It might now be imagined that the Popes, having been so highly obliged by Charlemagne, should in meer gratitude have done their utmost to preserve the Empire in peace, under his posterity; but they are great strangers to the Court of Rome, who look for any thing there, but what tends to their own advantage. For in the time of Ludovicus Pius, son of Charles the great, his sons combining together

*De transl.  
Imp. Rom.  
l. 1. c. 4.*

*Platin. in  
Steph. 2.  
Blond. de  
cad. 2. l. 1.*

*The distur-  
bances  
made by  
Popes, in  
the new  
Empire.*

*Annales  
Ecclef. ad  
A. D. 833.  
P. Æmilii  
in histor.  
Fran. p. 54.*

*Nithard.  
hist. l. 1. à  
Petr. Pithæ.  
ed. in Annal.  
Franc.*

*Vita Ludo-  
vici Pii à  
Pithæo ib.  
p. 245.*

*Papir. Mas-  
son. in vit.  
Greg. 4.*

gether against him in France, the Pope Gregory 4. going thither, under a pretence of reconciling them, joynes with the Sons in their Rebellion against their Father. This *Baronius* would have, to be a meer calumny; and endeavours to vindicate the Pope, because *Paulus Æmilius* saith, that the Pope abrogated the Decree, whereby *Ludovicus* was deprived of the Empire: But *Baronius* understood his business too well, to make use of the Testimony of so late an Author, if he could have had any assistance from those who lived near the time. *Nithardus*, who lived in the same age, and was nearly related to the Imperial Family, wrote a Book on purpose, of the differences among the Sons of *Ludov. Pius*; and he expressly saith, that they drew the Pope into their Party; which is likewise affirmed by the Author of the life of the said Emperour, who lived at the same time: the Pope, he saith, indeed pretended to reconcile them, but the event shewed it to be otherwise; and the Emperour sent to him to know if he came to him, what made him stay so long before he came at him? and Understanding that he came with a design to excommunicate all that would not joyn with the Sons against the Father, he said, that if he came to excommunicate others, he should go away excommunicated himself, because he acted against the Canons. *Papirius Massonus*, upon the Testimony of *Nithardus* (whom he calls *Vitaldus*) makes *Gregory* guilty of the conspiracy of the Sons against their Father: and the reason he gives of it is, that *Lotharius*, having the command of Italy, might dispossess

dispossess him of his seat if he opposed him; and more, he saith, are ready to worship the rising than the setting Sun. A very worthy excuse for the head of the Church to encourage the Rebellion of Sons against their Father; and him too, who had all his life shewed as much kindness to the Roman See, as his Ancestors had done! *Sigebertus Gemblacensis* saith, that Pope Gregory went into France being of the party of the Emperours Sons against himself. And *Hincmarus* the famous Bishop of Rhemes, who lived in the time of *Ludovicus* his sons, in his Letter to Pope *Hadrian 2.* saith, that Gregory came into France with *Lotharius*, against the Emperours will; and there was no peace in France after, as had been before; and that he returned with infamy to Rome. It would be too large a task to reckon up particularly all the quarrels which the Popes, after this, did either begin or foment among Christian Princes; I shall only at present single out some of the most remarkable of them, not mannaged by Beasts and Monsters, as their own Writers call some of their Popes, but persons applauded for their Wisdom and Courage, in maintaining the dignity of their See.

§. 4. Among these, Gregory 7. deserves the first place; I meddle not with other things in this life, which *Cardinal Benno* hath writ, (and is very weakly suspected by *Bellarmino* to have been made by some Lutheran; it being first published by a zealous Papist) but that which I design, is to shew, that under a pretence of advancing his Authority he was the great

*Sigiberti*  
*Chron. A.D.*  
*832.*  
*Hincmar.*  
*Rhemens.*  
*Epistol. p.*  
*577. ed.]*  
*Cord.*

Of the  
quarrels of  
*Greg. 7.*  
with the  
Emperour  
and other  
Christian  
Princes.

*Wispergens.  
Chronic. p.  
226. marg.*

*Otto Fri-  
sing. l. 6.  
c. 32.*

*Petr. Dami-  
ani Epistol.  
l. 1. ep. 16.*

*L. 1. Epist.  
ad Card.  
Ep. 8.*

great Bontefeu of Christendom. It is observed by some Historians that Henry 4. then Emperour, fought sixty two pitched Battails (ten more then ever Julius Caesar fought) and he may thank the Pope for so many opportunities to shew his courage. For he was no sooner well settled in his chair, but he finds a pretence of quarrelling with the Emperour; and he had such a spirit of contradiction in him, *that it was enough for any thing to displease him, to hear it was liked by the Emperour and the Bishops*, as Otto Frisingensis reports of him. While he was yet but Arch-deacon of Rome, Petrus Damiani, who was a Brother Cardinal with him, describes him as a person of the greatest pride and insolency imaginable, in a Letter to Pope Alexander 2. and Hildebrand his Arch-deacon, where in he calls him *Sanctum Satanam*, a holy Devil; and saith, *that his venerable pride had plowed him back with such severe stripes, that he was able to endure them no longer*: and in another Letter to himself alone, he saith, *that he could not get so much as a good word from him, though he wishes he had served God and St. Peter as heartily, as he had served him*: and that he followed no other Canons, but his Will: and his judgment did not follow his own thoughts, but his. This had been very fair, towards another man; but none of his fellow Bishops are matches for him, being Pope he cares for meddling with nothing under Crowns and Scepters; and those he takes upon him to dispose as freely as his predecessour did, when he said, *All these things will I give thee, only fall down and worship*

*worship me*: For this was the indispensable condition with him. I shall give a brief account of the affairs of the *Empire*, in his time; chiefly from *Sigonius*, who cannot be suspected for an *Henrician Heretick*, (as some of the *German* Historians are called; only for asserting the just Authority of their Prince against the *Popes* Usurpations) the first thing *Pope Hildebrand* began with, was the business of *investitures*; and at a *Council* in the *Lateran*, he *Decreed*, that in case any one received investiture from a Lay person, both he that gave, and he that received it, should be excommunicated; to which headjoyned a Decree against the *Marriage* of *Clergie-men*, which was no sooner published by his *Legats* in *Germany*, but all the *Clergy* were in an uproar, and charged the *Pope* with contradicting *S. Paul*, and that by this means he made way for all manner of uncleanness; and that they would rather part with their places, than submit to it; and when the *Arch-bishop* of *Mentz* was prevailed with to publish this Decree at *Erford*, the *Bishops* were so enraged, that the *Arch-bishop* fearing his life, dismissed the *Assembly*: the like opposition was made at *Milan*, against *Erlembaldus*; who was there killed, with *Luitprandus*, the only person who submitted to him: the *Pope* highly incensed, excommunicates all the *Bishops*, who sided with the *Emperour*, and forbids the people to communicate with any *Clergy-men* who had *Wives*, but not satisfied with this, he summons the *Emperour*, very Magisterially, to appear before him; and in case of neglect, that he should

*Sigonius de regno Italico l. 9. in Hen. 3 A. D. 1074.*

*Lambert Schaffnaburg. histor. German. A. D. 1074. p. 201. Sigebert Gemblor. Chron. A. 1074. Mont. Paris in Gul. I. Auentia. Annal. Bolog. or. l. 5. p. 564.*



be excommunicated. Henry in stead of appearing calls a *Council* of *Bishops*, who pronounce him an *unlawful Pope*, to which they all subscribed; which message was sent to the *Pope*, before his *Council* could meet; but *Hildebrand* encouraged himself, by the examples of his *Predecessors*, *Gregory 2 & 3*. (who took away the remainder of the *Empire* from *Leo*) and published a *Bull*, wherein he deprived the *Emperour* of his *Authority*, and absolved all his *Subjects* from their *Allegiance*, and forbade any to owne him for their *Prince*; upon which, a *Rebellion* in the *Empire* followed; only they allowed him time to make his peace with the *Pope* within the year, before they would choose a new *Emperour*. The poor *Emperour* finding so general a *revolt*, is faine to go into *Italy* without mony or retinue, till the *Bishops* of *Milan* and *Ravenna* and *Lombardy*, who held faithful to him, furnished him with both. The *Pope* hearing that, stops his journey into *Germany*, and returns to *Canusium*, a strong place belonging to his dear *Matbildis*, who out of great kindness never parted from him; thither came the *German Bishops* first, and beg their pardon barefoot; the *Pope* puts them severally into *Cells*, and there feeds them with bread and water; but at last upon promise never to discourse with the *Emperour*, before he had given him satisfaction, (unless it were to perswade him to it) they are dismissed. The *Emperour* now draws near to *Canusium*, and gets *Matbildis* and two more of greatest interest with the *Pope*, to intercede for him; but

but all they could prevail with him for, was, that this *servant of servants*, this *follower of St. Peter*, even the humble minded *Pope Hildebrand*, admits him within the second wall of the *Town*; where casting off his Royal habit, he was, barefooted in the midst of Winter, to wait for the *Popes* answer; in which posture he continued three days together; on the fourth, the *Pope* very graciously sends him word, he might come into his presence. If *Luifer* himself had sate in the Chair, he would not have denied him so much courtesie as his *Vicar* shewed him; who after submission to his own terms, and at his feet having begged absolution, absolved him. But the mean carriage of the *Emperour* herein, extremely disoblige the *Italians*: his friends; who began to slight and contemn him for it, and to say he was unworthy the *Empire*, and therefore would choose his *Son* in his room: *Henry* finding himself in this condition, returns to his old friends, who declared the terms null which the *Pope* had forced upon him; the *Pope* finding the *Emperour* resolved to defend his power, sends away two *Legats* into Germany, who met the *Princes* at the *Diet* in *Forcheim*; in which, by the approbation of the *Legats*, *Henry* is deposed, and *Rodolphus* of *Suevia* chosen *Emperour*. *Baronius* charges *Helmuldus*, and *Albertus Stadenfis*, with falshood in saying that *Greg. 7.* transferred the *Crown* to *Rodolphus*, and sent it with the known verse upon it; but whatever becomes of the verse, it seems strange, from *Baronius* his own story, that any one should question the

*Constitut.  
Imperialis  
Tom. 1. p.  
238.  
Baron. An-  
nales Eccles.  
A.D 1077.  
n. 40.*

thing. For was not his excommunicating Henry, the cause of the first defection from him? Did not he absolve the people from their *allegiance*? and after his absolution, when he found Henry resolved to maintain his power, did not he send his *Legats* on purpose into Germany, with instructions to the *Princes* to take care of the *Empire*? Were not his *Legats* present at all the proceedings, and approved them? How could then the *Pope* have no hand in it? unless it were, that he did not put the *Crown* upon his head himself, But saith *Baronius*, *Gregory*, in an *Epistle* of his, calls Peter and Paul to witness that he did not know of their choosing *Rodolphus*: but he doth not deny, that they proceeded to a new choice because Henry did not keep his terms with him: he had intimations enough given him, who was likeliest to be the man; and therefore he need not care any more, than to have a new election: and in the instructions given to his *Legats*, wherein he pretended to Umpire the business between them (after *Rodolphus* had sent his Son as hostage for his fidelity to the *Pope*) he gave them express commands, that which soever of them should not obey his will, that they should resist him to the death and excommunicate all that adhered to him; because, forsooth, it was the sin of Idolatry to condemn the *Apostolick See*: and concludes his Letter with that abominable hypocrisie, that herein he did not seek his own things, but the things of *Jesus Christ*. A way of abusing *Scripture* he had taught his friend *Mabildis*, when she used *St. Pauls* words, in a Letter

Letter to the Pope, to exprefs her love to him, that neither tribulation, nor diftrefs, nor perfecution, nor famine, nor nakednefs, nor fword, nor death, nor life, nor principalities, &c. fhould be able to feparate her from the love of St. Peter in Chrift Jefus our Lord; whom ſhe meant by St. Peter is very eafie to underftand, according to the conftant dialect of this Pope, whoſe Bulls and Anathema's againſt Princes ran in St. Peters name. But we leave Baronius admiring the Providence of God, that when Princes and Bifhops forfook the Church of Rome, he raiſed up Agnes the Emperours Mother, againſt her own Son, and Beatrix and Matilda, of near kindred to the Emperour, to ſupport the Pope againſt him; and not long after, we find him acknowledging that Rodolphus was confirmed by the Pope, and Henry again excommunicated by him; in the form of which excommunication, extant in Baronius, he deſires all the World to take notice, that it is in the Popes power to take away Empires, Kingdoms, Principalities, Dutchieſ, Marquiſates, Earldoms, and the poſſeſſions of all men from them, and give them to whom he ſhall think fit. But doth Baronius in the leaſt go about to explain, or mitigate this? no, but inſtead of it, he complains of the proſperity of the wicked: becauſe Henry obtained after this a ſignal victory over Rodolphus, in his fourth Battel, wherein he was wounded in his right hand, and (ſay the German Hiſtorians) acknowledged therein the juſt judgment of God being near his death; that being the hand, wherewith he had ſworn fidelity

Baron. ad  
A. 1074.  
n. 10.

Ad A. D.  
1080. in S.  
14.

N. 127

Heimold's  
Chron. Sla-  
vorum l. 1.  
cap. 29.  
Abbas ſer  
ſperc. ad  
to A. D. 1080,

to the *Emperour*; and then told his friends (whatever the *Pope* did swear by *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*) that the *Popes* command made him break his Oath: and take that honour upon him which did not belong to him; and he wished they who had put him upon it would consider, how they led men to their eternal damnation by such courses; which having said, with great grief of mind, saith *Helmoldus*, he dyed. And the *Pope* himself, did not escape much better; for the *Emperour* marches into *Italy*, with a great Army; takes in all the Towns, which opposed him; deposes *Hildebrand* by the *Bishops* of his party, as the cause of all the Warr and Bloodshed, and sets up *Gibert* of *Ravenna* under the name of *Clement 3.* besieges *Rome*; and the *Pope*, not trusting the Citizens who soon left him, secures himself in a Castle; from whence escaping to *Salerno*, he not long after there dyes. The only good thing we read of him, is that which *Sigebert* and *Florentius Wigorniensis*, and *Matthew Paris* report of him, from the testimony of the *Bishop* of *Meutz*, that he called, when he was dying, one of his Friends to him, and confessed that it was through the instigation of the Devil, that he had made so great a disturbance in the Christian world. Whether they who applaud and admire him in the *Roman Church*, as particularly *Baronius*, (who recommended him as a pattern to *Paul 5.* and rejoiced, to see a man of his spirit to succeed him) will believe this or no, we matter not, since there is so apparent evidence, for the truth of the thing. But we not only see, the whole

*Sigebert.*  
*Chron. ad*  
*A.D. 1085.*  
*Florent.*  
*Wigorn. ad*  
*A. 1084.*  
*Matt. Paris*  
*Histor.*  
*Anglic.*  
*A. 1087.*

*Aventin.*  
*Annal Boi-*  
*or. l. 5.*  
*p. 581.*

*Senten.*  
*Cardin. Ba-*  
*ronii super*  
*excomun.*  
*Vener.*

whole Empire put into a flame, under pretence of this Authority of the Pope, and Italy laid waste by it, to so great a degree, saith Sigonius, that Mothers devoured their children for meer hunger; but we may find him as busie, though not with equal success, with other Princes of Christendom. He threatens the King of France to deprive him (if he did not submit to him) and that his Subjects should certainly revolt from him, unless they would renounce their Christianity; which are the words of his Bull in Baronius: but finding no amendment, the next year he sends another; wherein he tells him, that if according to his hard and impenitent heart, he did treasure up the wrath of God and St. Peter, by the help of God he would excommunicate him, and all that should obey him: the same year he excommunicates in Italy, Robert Duke of Apulia, Prince of the Normans, and Gilulphus Prince of Salerno, and sends an Army against them. He threatens Alphonsus King of Spain, with the Sword of St. Peter; he excommunicates Nicephorus, Emperor of Constantinople; he not only deprives Boleslaus King of Poland of his Kingdom, and puts the whole Kingdom under an interdict, and forbids the Bishops anointing any for King, but whom he should appoint. Of all the Princes of Christendom, I find none so much in his favour as our William, the first of the Norman Race; for he coming into a Kingdom, where he found no interest but what his Sword made him, keeps a fair correspondence with the Pope, receives his Decrees, refuses to enter into an alliance against him; which so plea-

Sigon. de  
regno Ital.  
l. 9. ad  
A. 1084.

Baron. An-  
nal. ad  
A. D. 1073.  
n. 65.

Id ad A.  
1074. n. 53.

Id. ib. n. 32.

Id. ad A.  
1080 n. 49.  
Id. A. 1078.  
n. 15.

Mart. Cro-  
mer de  
gestis Poloa  
l. 4. ad fin.

Baron. ad  
A. D. 1074  
n. 52



Id ad A.D.  
1480, 2. 45.

Id A. 1079.  
2. 20.

Eadmer.  
prefat. ad  
bist. Novor-  
um.

Of the  
quarrels  
his Suc-  
cessors.  
Onuphrius  
in vit.  
Orig. 7.

fed him, whom all other Princes hated, that he sends to him in his distress, to come to his assistance, to divert the *Emperour*; and calls him *the Jewel of Princes*, and saith, that he ought to be the rule of obedience to all other Princes; but yet *William* himself could not escape his threatenings, when he forbade the *Bishops* of his Kingdom to go to *Rome*, and utterly denied taking any Oath of fidelity to the *Pope*, which he pressed upon him by his *Legat*; although *Baronius* make him to submit to the *Pope*, upon the receipt of his Letter; whereas the Letters of *Lanfranc* and the *King*, produced by himself, expressly contradict it. This we are sure of, that *William* all his time practised that right of investiture of *Bishops* by a staff and a ring, which had been the first cause of the quarrel between the *Emperour* and the *Pope*; and which he had so severely forbidden in several Councils at *Rome*, thereby to maintain his own authority, by taking off the *Bishops* of several Kingdoms from any acknowledgment of dependence on their own *Sovereign Princes*; which was the truest cause of all the quarrels of *Christianity* raised and fomented by this *Hell-brand*, as the *Centuriators* according to their *Dialect* call him.

And although *Onuphrius* in his life confess that this *Popes* designs if they had taken effect, would have quite overthrown the Majesty of the *Empire*; and that he was the first *Pope*, who ever attempted such things: yet he having now started so fair a game, though he died in the pursuit of it, his successors retrieved

it and followed it with all their might and skill; thence we read that *Urban*, being made Pope by *Hildebrand's* faction in opposition to the Emperor, renews the sentence of excommunication against him; and in the Council at *Piacenza*, not content barely to excommunicate him (in the presence of *Agnes* or *Adelain* the Emperours wife) he uttereth saith *Urspergensis*, very reproachful speeches against him: but he had been no fit successour for *Hildebrand*, who could content himself with bare words; especially, having declared his resolution to follow the steps of so worthy a predecessour: and so he did to purpose, when he set up *Conradus* the Emperours Son in Rebellion against his Father. This *Baronius* would fain shift off, as not arising from the Popes instigation, but some private discontents, for which he quotes *Dodechinus*; but *Sigonius*, who follows the same Author, saith expressly, that he took upon him the Kingdom of Lombardy against his Father, by the Authority of *Urban* himself: and *Bertholdus*, whose testimony is afterwards produced by *Baronius*, mentions not only their meeting at *Cremona*, but that *Conradus* there took an oath of fidelity to the Pope, and the Pope in requital solemnly promised him to give him all the advice and assistance he could, for the obtaining the Kingdom and Empire of his Father. What is fomenting and encouraging Rebellion in the highest degree, if this be not? And the sentence of Deposition of *Conrade* in the Diet at *Aken*, A.D. 1096. expressly mentions, as the cause of it, his adhering to Pope *Urban* against the Emperor his

*Sigebert.*  
*Gemblac ad*  
A.D. 1088.  
*Helmold.*  
*Chron. Slav.*  
l. i. c. 30.  
*Urspergens.*  
*Ciron. P.*  
235.  
*Baron. Ann.*  
*nales ad*  
A.D. 1088;  
v. 3.  
*Aventin.*  
*Annal. Boi.*  
or. l. 5.  
p. 590.  
*Baron. A.D.*  
1093. n. 3.  
*Sigon. de*  
*regno Ital.*  
l. 9. A. 1093  
*Bar. ad A.*  
D. 1095.  
n. 8.

*Constitut.  
Imper. Tom.  
l.p. 247.*

*Abbas Ier-  
spurg. Chron.  
p. 241.*

*Wersperg. ib.  
Bavon ad  
A. D. 1105.  
3. 4.*

*Avent. An-  
nales Boior.  
l. 5. p. 597.*

his *Father*; and there his Son *Henry* was declared his *successour*, and solemnly swears never to rebel against his *Father*. But notwithstanding this Oath, *Conrad* being dead, this *Son* is likewise, prevailed upon by the *Popes* instruments, to rebel against his *Father*: for *Pascal* 2. succeeding *Urban*, had again excommunicated *Henry* 4. and at a *Council* called by him in *Rome*, he made all the *Bishops* present, by particular subscription to Anathematize the *Emperours* heresie (as they were pleased to call it) and to promise obedience to *Paschal* and his *Successours*, and to affirm what the *Church* affirmed, and condemn what she condemns. Having by this means secured the *Bishops* from adhering to the *Emperours* party, there wanted not *Agents* to solicit his *Son*, to take away his *Crown* from him. And the first thing he did upon his rebellion was to Anathematize his *Fathers* heresie (which was keeping the *Empire* in spight of the *Popes*) and to promise obedience to the *Pope* as the *Bishops* had done at *Rome*; and in the *Diet* at *Northausen*, A. D. 1105. he calls *God* to witness, that it was no desire of the *Empire* which made him take his *Fathers* Government from him; but if he would obey the *Pope*, he would presently yield himself to him and become his *Slave*. And when the *Son* had in a perfidious manner seized on the Person of his *Father*, and he addressed himself to the *Popes* Legat for his safety, he plainly told him, he must look for none, unless he would publicly declare the justice of *Hildebrand*, and his own unjust persecutions of the *Roman See*. But, which is the most evident

dent testimony of all others in this case, Henry 4. a little before his death A. D. 1106. at Liege (whither he was forced to retire by his Sons rebellion) sends an account of the whole quarrel to Philip of France; wherein he declares, that he had offered all reasonable satisfaction to the Pope, only preserving the authority of the Empire; but this not being accepted, in a most unnatural manner, they had armed his most beloved Son, his Absolom against him; who, by their instigation and counsel, had most perfidiously dealt with him: but we need not so much proof of this, since Baronius confesseth, that the Son had no greater cause of rebelling against his Father, than that he was excommunicated by the Pope; and afterwards very freely delivers his mind, that in case the Son did it sincerely, as he pretended, i. e. out of obedience to the See of Rome, it was, saith he, an act of great piety in him, to be thus cruel to his Father: and that his only offence was, that he did not bind him faster till he was brought to himself, i. e. to the Popes beck. O the admirable doctrine of obedience at Rome! What an excellent commentary is this upon the fifth Commandment, and the thirteenth to the Romans! What mighty care hath the Church of Rome always taken, to preserve peace and unity in the Christian Church! The Historians who report the passages of this time, tell us, there was never known so dismal an age as that was, for Warrs and Bloodshed, for Murthers and Parricides, for Rapines and Sacriledge, for Seditions and Conspiracies, for horrible Schisms and Scandals to Religion,

Constitut.  
Imper. Tom.  
3. p. 318.

Baron ad  
A. 1106.  
n. 2. & 6.

Id ad A. D.  
1105. n. 6.

Id ad A. D.  
1106. n. 14.

Aventin.  
Annal Boi-  
or. l. 5. p.  
562.  
S'geberti  
Chronie. ad  
A. D. 1074.

the Priest opposing the Bishops, the People the Priests, and in some places not only robbing the Churches, burning the Tithes, but trampling under foot the holy Eucharist that was consecrated by such whom Pope Hildebrand had excommunicated. And must we after all this believe, that the Roman See is the fountain of Unity in the Catholick Church; that all Warrs and Rebellions arise from casting off such subjection to the Popes, who have been the great fomenters of Rebellions ever since Hildebrands time, and the disturbers of the peace of Christendom? For we are not to imagine that this quarrel ended with Henry 4. for it was revived again in Henry the fifth's time between Pope Paschal and him; and the Pope grants him the privileges, which his Father contended for; but afterwards revoked his own grant (perjury being no sin at Rome, in so holy a cause) and raised a Rebellion in the Empire against him; and notwithstanding several agreements, made between him and the successive Popes, could enjoy no lasting peace in his time, upon their account; and dyed at last without issue, going to suppress a new Rebellion. After his death, Conradus being to succeed as Sisters Son to Henry 5. Lotharius by the arts of the Court of Rome, was set up in opposition to him: he was fain to part with the rights of the Empire to satisfy the Pope; who made him receive the Imperial Crown, at his feet. In the time of Conradus, who succeeded Lotharius, the Pope encouraged Guelfo the Duke of Bavaria in a Rebellion against him (from whom the

two loving factions of *Guelphs* and *Gibellines* had their beginning ) It would be endless to relate the *disturbances* of the Christian world, which arose from the contentions of several *Popes*, about their Authority, with *Frederick Barbarossa*, *Philippus Suevus*, *Otho 4.* *Frederick 2.* *Ludovicus Bavarus*, and other Emperours, till such time as the Majesty of the Empire was lost in *Carolus 4.* or if we should give an account of all the *Warrs*, and *Rebellions*, and *Seditions*, and *Quarrels*, which happened meerly upon pretence of the *Papal Authority*, in our own *Nation*, or in *France*, or elsewhere. But these may, at present, suffice to give testimony, what an excellent instrument of Peace to the *Christian world*, the *Authority* challenged by the *Bishop of Rome* hath been : and the same *Authority* is still vindicated and asserted in the *Court of Rome*.

§. 6. 2. But although such civil disturbances have happened, by the contentions about the *Papal authority*; yet they may say, *the Church hath had its unity still*, as long as they were united in the same Head : For this they look on, as the great foundation of *Unity*; for say they, the unity of the body consists in the conjunction of the members with the head, and then with one another : and although there may be many other sorts of *Unity* in the Church, yet the essential *Unity of the Church*, they tell us, lyes in conjunction of the members under one Head. But what becomes then of the *Unity of the Roman Church* in the great number of *Schisms*, and some of long

Of the  
Schisms in  
the Roman  
Church.

Beſſarm. de  
rotis Ecclef.  
l. 4. c. 10.  
De Ecclſ.  
mil. l. 3.  
c. 5.



long continuance among them? Were they all members united under *one Head*, when there were sometimes two, sometimes three several *Heads*? *Bellarmino* in his *Chronologie*, confesseth twenty six several *Schisms* in the Church of *Rome*; but *Onuphrius*, a more diligent searcher into these things, reckons up thirty; whereof some lasted ten years, some twenty, one fifty years. And it seems very strange to any one, that hears so many boasts of *Unity* in the Church of *Rome* above others, to find more *Schisms* in that Church, than in any *Patriarchal Church* in the World. We should think, if the *Bishop* of *Rome* had been designed *Head* of the Church and the fountain of *Unity*, that it was as necessary that Church should be freed from intestine divisions on that account, as to be secured from errors in faith, if it had the promise of *Infallibility*; for errors are not more contrary to *Infallibility*, than divisions are to *Unity*: and the same Spirit can as easily prevent *Schisms*, as *Heresies*. But as the errors of that Church are the clearest evidence, against the pretence of *Infallibility*; so are the *Schisms* of it, against its being the fountain of *Unity*: for how can that give it to the whole Church, which so notoriously wanted it in it self? I shall not need to insist on the more ancient *Schisms*, between *Cornelius* and *Novatianus* and their parties, between *Liberius* and *Felix*, between *Damasus* and *Ursicinus*, between *Bonifacius* and *Eulalius*, between *Symachus* and *Laurentius*, between *Bonifacius* and *Dioscorus*, between *Sylverius* and *Vigilius*, and many others;

others. I shall only mention those, which were of the longest continuance in that Church, and do most apparently discover the *divisions* of it. I begin with that which first brake forth in the time of *Formosus*, who was set up *A. D.* 821. against *Sergius*, whom the faction of the *Margues* of *Tuscany* would have made *Pope*; but the popular faction then prevailing, *Sergius* was forced to withdraw, and *Formosus*, with continual opposition from the other party, enjoyed the Papacie four years and six months; not without the blood of many of the chief Citizens of *Rome*, slain by *Arnulphus* in the quarrel of *Formosus*. After his death *Boniface* 6. intruded, saith *Baronius*, into the *Papal See*, but was after fifteen days dispossessed by *Stephanus* 7. who in a Council called for that purpose, nulled all the acts of *Formosus*, deprived all those of their Orders, who had been ordained by him, and made them be Re-ordained; and not content with this, he caused his body to be taken out of the Grave, and placed it in the Popes Chair with the Pontifical habits on; where after he had sufficiently reviled him, that could not revile again, he caused the three Fingers to be cut off, with which he used to give Benediction and Orders, and the Body to be thrown into *Tiber*. This last part *Onuphrius* would have to be a fable, and *Andreas Victor* from him; but *Baronius* saith, they are mistaken who say so; for not only *Luitprandus*, who lived in that Age, expressly affirms it, (although he attributes it to *Sergius*, upon whose account the Schism begun: ) but the acts of the

Roman

*Onuphr.*  
*Annot. in*  
*Plat. vit.*  
*Formos.*  
*Victorel*  
*add. ad.*  
*Ciaccon. de*  
*vit. Pontif.*

Baron. An-  
nal. ad  
A.D. 897.  
x. 2. 3.  
Papir. Ma-  
son de Epif-  
cop. Urb. l.  
3. p. 151.

Morinus de  
Sacris Ec-  
cles. ordinat.  
par 2. p. 348

Roman Council under John 9. extant in Baro-  
nius make it evident: and Papirius Massonus  
cites other ancient Historians for it. Upon  
this nulling the Ordinations of *Formosus*, a great  
dispute was raised in the Church; for many  
of the *Bishops* would not submit to re-ordina-  
tion, and particularly *Leo Bishop* of *Nola*, to  
whom *Auxilius* writ his Book in defence of the  
Ordinations of *Formosus*, a short account where-  
of is published by *Baronius* from *Papirius Mas-  
son*; but the whole Book is now set forth from  
an ancient Manuscript, by *Morinus*; by which  
we understand the controversie of that time  
much better than we could before. Two things  
were chiefly objected against *Formosus* his Or-  
dinations. 1. That against the Canons of the  
Church he was translated from one See to ano-  
ther; being *Bishop* of *Porto*, before he was made  
*Bishop* of *Rome*. 2. That having been degraded  
by *John* 8. (although restored by his succes-  
sor *Marinus*, and absolved from his Oath) he  
was not capable of conferring Orders. Against  
the first of these *Auxilius* shews, that translati-  
on from one See to another cannot null Ordina-  
tion, from the testimony of Pope *Anterus*, the  
example of *Greg. Nazianzen*, *Perigenes*, *Dosi-  
theus*, *Reverentius*, *Palladius*, *Alexander*, *Mel-  
tius*, and many others. That the *Nicene Canon*  
against translations, was interpreted by the  
Council of *Chalcedon* so as not to extend to all  
cases, and it was so understood by Pope *Leo* and  
*Gelasius*; and however, that only nulls the tran-  
slation, and not the ordination. Against the second  
he pleads, that supposing it not to be lawful

to remove from one *Episcopal See* to another, yet the Ordination may be valid; for *Formosus* was not Consecrated again himself, but only reconciled by *Marinus*; that the Popes, *Gregory* and *Leo*, had declared against *Re-ordination*, as much as against *Re-baptizing*; that the *Canons* of the *Apostles* had forbidden it; that the Ordinations by *Acacius*, were allowed by *Anastasius*; that the *Bonosiaci*, though Hereticks, had their Orders allowed them; that the *Cathari* were admitted to the Churches Communion by the *Council* of *Nice*, only with imposition of hands; that though *Liberius* fell to the *Arian* Heresie, yet his Ordinations afterwards were not nulled; neither those of *Vigilius*, although he stood excommunicated by *Silverius*, and added Homicide to it: that the nulling these Ordinations was to say in effect, that for twenty years together they had been without the Christian Religion in *Italy*: that none but Hereticks could assert these things; that if any Popes themselves speak or act against the *Catholic faith or religion*, they are not to be followed in so doing. This is the substance of the first Book of *Axilius*, which things are more largely insisted upon in the second. But by that Book it appears most evidently, that the Barbarous usage of the body of *Formosus* was most true; it being expressly mentioned therein, and justified by him, in the Dialogue that pleads for *Re-ordination*. And now saith *Baronius*, began those most unhappy times of the Roman Church, which exceeded the persecutions of Heathens or Hereticks: but he, out of his constant good

*Baron. Annual ad A. D. 897. n. 8, 9.*

*Platina in  
vit. Steph 6.*

*Ad. A. D.  
900. n. 1.*

will to civil Authority, layes the fault altogether upon the power of the *Marquesses of Tuscany*, who had then too great power in *Rome*; but he strangely admires the providence of *God*, in keeping the *Heads* of the *Church* from *Hereſie*, all that time. Alas for them! they did not trouble themselves about any matters of faith at all, but were wholly given over to all manner of wickedness, as himself confesseth of them; when *Theodora*, that Mother of the Church of *Rome*, ruled in chief, and her daughter *Marocia's* Son by *Pope Sergius* came to be *Pope* himself; when, as *Platina* saith, it grew to be the custome of *Popes*, to null all that their predecessours had done. Were not these goodly heads of the Church the mean time? and did not they keep the Church in great Unity, under their agreeable conduct? Methinks the providence of *God*, is as much concerned to preserve holiness and peace, as faith in the world, and were not these excellent instruments for doing it! *Baronius* grants the acts of *Stephanus* to be such, as the most barbarous Nations could not endure to bear of, and are too bad to be believed: and all the following Age he calls *Iron* for its rust and barrenness, and *leaden* for its badness and dulness; and confesseth that Monsters of impurity then reigned in the Apostolical See, that infinite evils sprung from thence, and horrible Tragædies, and mischiefs not to be spoken of. And yet a very Catholick faith, and the Unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace must be supposed to be there infallibly all this while; but if all their faith and unity be of such a kind as was in the 10 Century in the *Roman Church*;

Church; I should think *Baronius* might have said more in admiration of the providence of God, in preserving the *Catholick faith* and *Unity* among the *Devils* in *Hell*! for the *Scripture* tells us, *they believe and tremble*; and our Saviour saith, *that the Devils Kingdom cannot stand, if it be divided against it self*; and these are clearer and stronger testimonies, than can be brought of the *faith* and *Unity* of the *Roman Church*; when such horrid wickedness is acknowledged to have had *Dominion* in it, and that Church had this disadvantage of the *Devils Kingdom*, that it was *divided against it self*: In the very beginning of this *Century*, *Pope Stephen* is cast into *Prison*, and there strangled, as *Baronius* proves from his *Epitaph*; and now the *Roman faction* prevailing, they make one *Romanus* *Pope*, the first and only thing he did, was to condemn all that *Stephen* had done, as *Platina*, *Onuphrius*, and *Ciacconius* all agree; but he continued not much above four months; after him *Theodorus*, who held out about twenty dayes, and followed the steps of *Romanus*; to him succeeded *John 10.* (as *Platina* calls him) of the same faction, who set all *Formosus* his *Acts* to rights again, condemning all that *Stephen* had done in a *Council* at *Ravenna*; whither he was driven by the prevalency of the faction at *Rome* against him; where in the presence of seventy four *Bishops*, the *Acts* of the *Council* under *Stephen* were burnt, in which the *Ordinations* of *Formosus* were nulled; and *Sergius*, *Benedictus*, and *Marinus* were *Anathematized*, for being instruments in the *Acts* against

N. 6;



*Formosus*. The next Pope *Benedict* escapes without any thing, but a dull Epitaph; but *Leo* his successour had not been above forty dayes in the place, but he is cast into Prison, by one of his servants, who is made Pope in his place, and seven months after he is served the same way by *Sergius*, who now at last recovered the *Popedom*; and the greatest thing he did was to condemn *Formosus* again, and all who had appeared for him: so that now, as *Sigebert* saith, nothing was talked of so much as *ordinations*, and *exordinations*, and *superordinations*, by the contrary

*Baron. A.*  
*908. n. 3.*

*A. D. 911.*  
*n. 14.*

*A. D. 918.*  
*n. 2.*

*Luitprand.*  
*hist. l. 3.*

*c. 12.*

*Baron. ad.*

*A. 933. x. 1.*

*Acts* of these Popes to one another. *Baronius* confesseth *this* *Sergius* to have been a man of a most infamous and dissolute life: after his death, *Theodora* was not at rest till she had gotten her Gallant to be Pope under the name of *John 11. and* what manner of Cardinals, saith *Baronius*, may we imagine such a Pope would make? But *Marozia* her daughter was not so well pleased with him; for by her order, his Brother was killed in his presence, and he put into prison, and there smothered. After him, saith *Luitprandus*, her own Son by Pope *Sergius*, is made Pope; who was cast into Prison, by his Brother *Albericus*; who being not pleased with *Stephen*, who followed him, he was set upon and so wounded and deformed thereby, that he durst not let his face be seen; and the seditions, saith *Platina*, continued so high in his time, that he could do no great thing. At last, *Alberic's* Son, called *Octavianus*, got possession of the See, under the name of *John 13.* (or 12. as others beside *Platina* call him) who was such a

Monster

Monster for all wickedness, that *Otho* the Em-  
 perour was called into *Italy* to displace him ;  
 who called a *Council*, wherein he was accused  
 for ordaining a *Deacon* in a *Stable*, and making *Baron A.D.*  
 a *Bishop* of ten years of age ; but these were *903. n. 15.*  
 small faults to his *Adulteries*, *Sacriledge*, *Cruel-*  
*ties*, *drinking healths* to the *Devil* ; and at *Dice*  
*calling upon the Devils for help*. When these  
 accusations were sent to him from the *Coun-*  
*cil*, he only threatned to excommunicate them  
 all, if they chose another *Pope* against him :  
 but they not regarding his threatning depose  
 him, and choose *Leo 8.* in his place. Here  
*Baronius* storms unreasonably, that a *Council* *N. 27, 28,*  
 should take upon it to depose a *Pope*, though so *&c.*  
 abominably bad, as he confesseth this man to  
 have been ; and makes them guilty of an into-  
 lerable Error and Heresie in so doing, because  
 it implyes their believing that the power of the  
 Keys did depend on the worth of the person ! and  
 therefore he detests *Leo* as a *Schismatical Pope*.  
 And to make sure of a *Schism*, after the infam-  
 ous death of *John 13.* being killed in the  
 act of *Adultery*, the opposite faction in *Rome*  
 chose *Benedict 5.* to succeed him, who was carri-  
 ed away prisoner by *Otho* into *Germany* ; but be-  
 fore his death *John 13.* called a *Council*, wherein  
 he nulled all the *Acts* of the other *Council*, and *A. 964. n. 7.*  
 pronounced them *Schismaticks* ; and decreed, that  
 all that were ordained by them must be re-ordained.  
 Is not here now a most admirable *Unity* in the  
 Roman Church ? After *Leo*, another *John* is  
 chosen by the *Emperours* party ; but, as *Platina*  
 saith it being now grown customary to depose *Popes*,

they drive him away by seditions against him, being first imprisoned by Rotfredus and then expelled the City. But they suffered sufficiently for it, by the severity of Orto against them. — The next Pope, *Benedict 6.* was cast into Prison by the other faction, and there strangled, or starved. *John 14.* came to his end after the same manner, dying in Prison, by the faction of *Ferrucius* the Father of *Boniface 7.* who was driven away from Rome after his being made Pope; after whom, *Benedict 7.* was set up; and *John* succeeding him, *Boniface's* faction recovering again, he was for a few months restored to the Poppedome. Against *Greg. 5.* the faction of *Crescentius* set up one *Job. 17.* who by the power of the Emperour was deprived of his eyes and the Poppedome together, and a little after of his life. Methinks it is very pleasant, in the midst of all the villanies and Devilish enmities which those Popes practised towards one another, to see *Baronius* so gravely admiring their Orthodoxy.

But these factions in Rome, did not end with this Century; for in the next, *A. D. 1044.* we find a new Schism breaking out on the account of them. We are contented to take the story, as *Baronius* relates it in that year. *Benedict 9.* was made Pope, by the faction of the Counts of *Tusculum (Frascati)* out of opposition to which, and dislike of *Benedict*, the people of Rome deposed him, and set up *Sylvester 3.* who got the Poppedome by Simony, and enjoyed it but three months; when (the *Tusculan* faction again prevailing) *Sylvester* was deposed, and *Benedict*

restored;

restored ; but finding himself hateful to the people, he resigns to *John* ( called *Greg. 6.* ) or as *Platina* saith some affirm, sold it to him. *Otto Frisingensis* saith, these three sat together in the City of Rome, and all of them led very bad lives, as he heard himself at Rome. But *Baronius* will not have *Greg. 6.* to be the same with *John*, one of the Schismatical Popes, but *Gratian*, who, by fair offers ( not to be called *Simony* ) perswading the other three to part with their places, got the possession of the *Pope-dome* alone. *Alphons. Ciacconius* follows *Onuphrius*, in saying that his name was *Job. Gratianus*, but not one of the three *Anti-Popes* sitting together ; wherein neither *Baronius*, nor he, can sufficiently clear themselves. If he were distinct, there must be five *Popes* at the same time ; for this *Greg. 6.* was deprived with the rest by a *Council*, called by the *Emperour Hen. 3.* at *Sutrium*. For *Baronius* is very much mistaken in saying, that the other three *Popes* were all deprived two years before ; for his own Author *Hermannus* asserts, that the cause of the false *Popes* was there diligently discussed, and *Greg. 6.* deprived for *Simony*, and *Ciacconius* expressly saith, after other Authors ; ( however *Baronius* strives to vindicate him, out of kindness to his name sake and Disciple *Greg. 7.* ) and *Clement 2.* is there made *Pope*, who enjoyed it but a little time, being poisoned, saith *Platina* by *Damasus 2.* who succeeded him ; but after the death of both these, *Benedict 9.* got into possession of the *Papacy* again, and the fifth time after the death of *Leo 9.* in whose

Baron. An.  
ad A. D.  
1052. n. 6.

time a great contröversie arose again about Re-ordination, viz. of such who had been ordained by *Simoniacal persons*: and although Leo had determined in Council, that upon forty dayes penance, they might perform the duties of their function; yet it appears by an Epistle of Petrus Damiani, extant in Baronius, that this Contröversie remained still, and they thought all actions done by such persons, no other than if they had been done by Lay-men; but we find nothing done in it to suppress this heresie, as he calls it, although he earnestly desires the Pope to condemn it. We are now fallen into the times of Hildebrand, who caused Benedict 10. to be deprived of the Papacy, before he came to it himself; for he called together the discontented Cardinals at Siena, where they discarded Benedict, and chose Nicolaus 2. The Schism that happened in his own time, I have already spoken to, which I shall therefore pass by; as likewise the others, that followed upon the opposition between the Popes and Emperours; although it is not to be imagined, that there could be greater divisions among men, than were upon the account of those two factions; especially, after they came to be distinguished by the names of *Guelphs* and *Gibellines*; it being ordinary for them to murder each other where ever they met, for a mighty demonstration of the peace and unity of the Roman Church.

I shall only now enquire, whether all these Schisms and Factions happened among them, only on the account of the differences between

the

the Popes and Emperors; and we shall find, that the agreement among themselves was only from that external opposition; and when that ceased, new *Factions* and *Schisms* brake forth among them. Of which *Italy* was so full, that the election of *Popes* became the work of years, by reason of the heats which were among them: But I meddle not with these factions in elections although they are no great indications of the presence of the *Holy Ghost* among them. But I shall only touch at the greatest *Schism*, for continuance, they ever had among them (as their *Historians* reckon it) which lasted with great animosities, for fifty years together; in which all the Princes of *Christendome* were concerned, and one party was alwayes condemning the other with the greatest bitterness, and condemning all the acts done by the other, and pronouncing them null and void. This was begun, upon the election of *Urban 6.* at which the *Cardinals*, declaring a force by the Souldiers & people of *Rome* when they were withdrawn from thence to a place of safety, chose another Pope, viz. *Clem. 7.* who sat in *France*, as *Urban* and his Successors did in *Rome*; he made twenty seven *Cardinals*, and *Petrus de Luna*, or *Benedict. 13.* succeeded him; and notwithstanding all the endeavours could be used to suppress this *Schism*, it still continued; & the means for that end, did rather increase it, as the *Council of Pisa*, which instead of two *Popes* made three, setting up *Alexan. 5.* besides *Greg. 12.* and *Benedict. 13.* and after him *John 23.* was chosen at *Bononia*: and although afterwards the *Council of Constantine* deprived

*John*



Alphonf.  
Ciaccon vit.  
Pontif. in  
Clem. 7.

*John 23. and Benedict. 13. and chose Martin 5. yet Benedict never yielded; and after his death, the Cardinals that were with him chose Clem. 8. against Martin 5. who were so far from yielding him to be true Pope, that they rather chose to rot in Prison, as they did; and so saith Ciacconius, This Schism was ended after fifty two years, which had given so great disturbance to the whole Christian World. One might have imagined now, when Councils were called for that purpose, that an end should thereby be put to these Schisms among them; but it was so far otherwise, that we find another Schism begun in that Church not long after, by the Authority of the Council of Basil which chose Felix 5. in opposition to Eugenius 4. where there was not only Pope against Pope, but Council against Council too; Eugenius sitting at that time with the Council of Florence. In the time of Julius 2. we find Council against Council again, that at Pisa, and the Lateran at Rome, both called General Councils, and condemning each other. By which we see, how far the Church of Rome is from being free from dangerous Schisms in it self; and therefore hath no cause to object them to others. The only thing pleaded, in answer to this charge of their numerous Schisms, is, that these were most of them Controversies concerning elections of Popes (which is all the salvo Molanus hath for it, at the end of Onuphrius his Chronologie) but what is that to the purpose? since the Question was, which of them was the Head of the Church, with whom the members were to be united? and all those who were*

not

not united with him whom they account the true Head, must be as much in *Schism*, as they who renounce all subjection to the Pope. For are not those as much in Rebellion, who set up an *Usurper* against their *lawful Prince*, as they who deny him to be their *Prince*, and to have any authority over them, because they look on themselves as a *Free-State*? There can be but one *lawful Head of the Church*, by their own principles; and only they are truly united to the *Church*, who are in conjunction with the *lawful Head*; and therefore it follows upon their own principles, that they must be in a *state of Schism*, who are united with any other than the *true Head*. What then signifie the boasts of *Unity* in the *Roman Church*, if they cannot prevent the falling of their members into such dangerous *Schisms*? To what purpose is it, to tell us of one *Head of the Church*, to whom all must submit, if there have been several pretenders to that *Headship*, and the *Church* hath been a long time divided, which of them was the true? Unless all their *Unity* comes to this at last, that they have an excellent *Unity* among them if they could all agree: And such an *Unity* may be had any where. But if all were agreed, what need any means of agreement by one *Universal Head*? or what can that *universal Head* signifie to making *Unity*, when his title to his *Headship* becomes a cause of greater divisions? May not we say upon better grounds, that taking away the Popes authority would tend much more to the peace of the *Church*; since that hath been the cause of so great disturbances

in

in the world, and is to this day one of the greatest differences between the several parts of the *Catholick Church*? For as things now stand in the *Christian World*, the *Bishop of Rome* is so far from being the *Fountain of Unity*, that he is much rather the *Head of Contention*, and the great cause of the *divisions* of the *Christian Church*.

Of the differences in the Roman Church, about matters of Government.

§. 7. 3. The differences have been as great in the Roman Church, as out of it; both as to *matters of order*, and *doctrine*.

(1.) For *matters of Order and Government*; Have not the controversies between the *Regulars* and *Seculars*, among them even herein *England*, been managed with as much heat and warmth, as to matter of *Episcopal jurisdiction*, as between those of the *Church of England*, and the dissenters from it? Neither is this any lately started controversy among them, but hath continued ever since the prevalency of the *Mendicant Fryers*, and their pretences of exemptions from *Episcopal jurisdiction*, and encroaching upon the office of the *Parochial Clergy*. For no sooner did the *Fryers* begin publicly under pretence of priviledges, to take upon them to preach, *without licence from the Bishops*, where they pleased, and to take other offices of the *Parochial Clergy* out of their hands, but great opposition was made against them, by all the learned men who were friends to the *Episcopal power*, and the peace of the *Church*. Which being a matter of concernment for us to understand, I shall give a faithful account of it, from the best Writers of their own Church. Aftoon

as the *Monastick Orders* were found to be very serviceable to the *Interest* of the *Court of Rome*, it was thought convenient to keep them in an immediate dependance upon the *Pope*, in what ever *Countrey* they were. From hence came the great favour of *Popes* to them, and their willingness to grant them almost what privileges they desired; because receiving them only from the plenitude of the *Popes power*, they were obliged to maintain and defend that from whence they derived them. At first, when they led a more properly *Monastick life*, the privileges granted them seem to be nothing else, but exempting them from some troubles which were inconsistent with it; either relating to their persons, or the estates they enjoyed. After this, they began to complain of the numbers of people flocking to their *Churches*, as inconsistent with their private and retired life; from hence we first read that publick *Masses* by the *Bishop* were forbid in *Monasteries*, to prevent a concourse of people, and especially of *Women* to them. But a long time after this they lived in subjection to the *Bishops*, and meddled no more in *Ecclesiastical* than in *Secular matters*. So *Charles M.* in his *Capitular*, commands them to keep within their *Manasteries*, to be subject to their *Bishops*, and to meddle in no *Ecclesiastical matters*, without the expresse command of the *Bishop*. But as the *Popes* increased their authority, the *Monks* enlarged their privileges, and procured exemptions from *Episcopal jurisdiction*; which yet was not pleasing to those, who valued the *Churches* peace above the pri-

*Gregor. l. 4.  
Epist. 43.  
Caroll. M.  
Capitular.  
l. 5. n. 25.*

Bernard.  
Epist. 42. ad  
Hen. Senon.  
De consider.  
l. 3. c. 4.  
Ivo Carnot.  
Ep. 29.  
Et 276.  
Petri Ble-  
sens. Ep. c. 8.

priviledges of the *Monastick Orders*. These exemptions are therefore highly condemned by *S. Bernard*, though a *Monk* himself, as tending to the dissolution of the *Ecclesiastical Government*; and by *Ivo Carnotensis*, who saith, he grew weary of his *Episcopal Government*, by reason of them. *Petrus Blesensis*, hath an *Epistle* written to *Pope Alexander 3.* in the name of *Richard Archbishop of Canterbury*, against the *Abbot of Malmesbury*, who refused subjection to the *Bishop of Salisbury*, and being cited by the *Archbishop* to appear before him for his contempt, he declared he would be subject to none but the *Pope*; and said, they were pitiful *Abbots*, who did not wholly exempt themselves from the *Bishops power*, when they might for an annual pension to the *Pope* obtain an absolute exemption. Therefore the *Archbishop* saith, it was time for them to complain, because this Contagion did spread it self far, and the *Abbots* set themselves against their *Bishops and Metropolitans*: and the *Popes* by indulging these things, did command disobedience and Rebellion, and arm the *Children* against their *Fathers*; but these and many other complaints signified nothing in the *Court of Rome*, as long as their profit and interest were advanced by it. And although we read of many affronts which the *Monks* put upon the *Bishops*, before the time of the *Mendicant Fryers*, yet their insolency grew the highest, when they took upon them to preach in *Parockial Churches*, and hear *Confessions* without the *Bishops* leave. Thence the *University of Paris*, published the Book *De periculis novissimorum temporum*; which

although

although written by S. *Amour*, went abroad  
in the name of all the *Divines* there, as ap-  
pears by the beginning of it: wherein a Cha-  
racter is given of those persons, who should  
make *the last times so troublesome*, "they should  
"be lovers of themselves, not enduring reproof,  
"covetous both of riches and applause, high-  
"minded, because they would not be in sub-  
"jection to the *Bishops*, but be set before them:  
"and therefore *disobedient* to their spiritual  
"Fathers. And such as these are said to creep  
"into houses, which the ordinary *Gloss* expounds  
"of those who enter into the houses of those  
"who are under anothers charge: these en-  
"ter not by the door, as the *Rectors* of Churches  
"do; but steal into them like *Thieves* and  
"Robbers, and leading captive silly women, is  
"their setting them against the *Bishops*, and per-  
"swading them to a Monastick life. These are  
"likewise *false Teachers*, who though never  
"so learned and holy, teach without being  
"sent; and none are duly sent, but such as are  
"chosen and authorized by the Church, such  
"as *Bishops* and *Presbyters* are; the one succeed-  
"ing the *Apostles*, the other the 72 *Disciples*:  
"and afterwards they deny, that the *Pope* him-  
"self can give any power to others, to meddle  
"in the charge of a *Parish*, or in *Preaching*  
"among them, but where they are invited to  
"it; because *Bishops* themselves cannot other-  
"wise act out of their own *Dioceses*; and that  
"the *Pope* in this case doth injury, by viola-  
"ting the rights of others: and if he should  
"go about to destroy what the *Prophets* and  
"Apostles

*De periculis  
noviss. tem-  
porum. p. 18.*

*Cap. 2.*



Cap. 3.

Cap. 4.

Cap. 5.

Cap. 9.

“ *Apostles* have taught, he would err in so  
 “ doing. Besides, say they, if these *Prædicants*  
 “ *Fryers* have a liberty to preach where they  
 “ please, they are all *universal Bishops*; and be-  
 “ cause maintenance is due to all who preach,  
 “ the people will be bound to pay *procurations*  
 “ to them, which will be an unreasonable bur-  
 “ den upon them. Many other Arguments they  
 “ use against this new sort of *Itinerant Preachers*,  
 “ and represent the dangers that came to the  
 “ Church by them at large: wherein they de-  
 “ scribe them, as a kind of *hypocritical Secta-*  
 “ *ries*, that abused the people under a fair  
 “ shew and pretence of *Religion*; having, as  
 “ they say, a *form of godliness, but denying the*  
 “ *power of it*: and that the persecution of the  
 “ Church by them, would be equal to what it was  
 “ by *Tyrants* and open *Hereticks*; because they  
 “ are familiar enemies, and do mischief under  
 “ a shew of kindness. And that one of the great  
 “ dangers of the Church by them would be,  
 “ their possessing *Princes and people with prejudices*  
 “ *against the Government of the Church by the*  
 “ *Bishops*; which, having done, they can more  
 “ easily lead them into errors, both against  
 “ faith, and a good life. That their way of  
 “ dealing is first with the *women*, and by them  
 “ seducing the men, as the Devil first tempted  
 “ Eve, and by her Adam; and when they have  
 “ once seduced them, they tie them by oaths  
 “ and vows, not to hearken to the counsel of  
 “ their *Bishops*, or those who have the care of  
 “ their souls. That the *Bishops* ought to suppress  
 “ these, and call in the publick help to do it,  
 “ and

" and to purge their *Dioceses* of them : and that  
 " if they do it not, *the blood of the people will* cap. 10.  
 " *be required of them*, and destruction will come  
 " upon them for it : and though *Princes* and cap. 11.  
 " people had taken their part, that ought not  
 " to discourage them ; but their folly ought  
 " to be made manifest to all men. After this, cap. 12.  
 " they lay down the means to be used for sup-  
 " pressing them, and the signs for their dis-  
 " covery ; saying, that *they are idle persons, busie*  
 " *bodies, wandring beggars*, against the *Apostles* cap. 13.  
 " express command, who would have all such cap. 14.  
 " excluded the Church as *disorderly livers* : and  
 " therefore conclude, with an earnest exhor-  
 " tation to all who have a care of the Church,  
 " to rise up against them, as the pernicious  
 " enemies of its peace and welfare. All these  
 things, which are only summarily comprehended  
 in that Book, are very largely insisted upon  
 by *Gul. de Sancto Amore*, in another Book  
 entituled, *Collections of Holy Scripture*, which  
 is wholly upon this subject. The *Mendicant*  
*Fryers* being thus assaulted, endeavoured to  
 defend themselves as well as they could, and  
 made choice of the best wits among them, for  
 their Champions ; such as *Bonaventure*, and  
*Aquinas* then were, who undertook their  
 cause, and were fain to shelter themselves,  
 under the plenitude of the *Popes* power ; by  
 which means, they were sure to have the *Pope*  
 on their side ; but his *Authority* was here no  
 means of *Unity*, for the controverlie continu-  
 ed long after, and was managed with great  
 heat, on both sides.

Of the  
insuffici-  
ency of the  
Popes au-  
thority for  
ending this  
Contro-  
versie.

§. 8. Upon the great complaint, of the *priviledges* and *exemptions* which the *Monastick orders* had obtained from the *Popes*, *Clement 5.* promised to have this business discussed, in the *Council of Vienna*; and to that end, gave order to several learned men to write about it; among whom particularly *Durandus Mimatensis* writ a large discourse (not mentioned by *Possevin*) but Printed *A. D.* 1545. "wherein he per-  
"swades the *Pope*; to revoke all such exem-  
"ptions, because they were contrary to the  
"ancient *Canons* of the *Church*; whereby, from  
"the *Apostles* times, all places and persons  
"whatsoever were immediately under the jurif-  
"diction of the *Bishops*; and that the *Pope* nei-  
"ther ought, nor could change this order of  
"the *Church*. Because the order of *Bishops*, being  
"appointed to prevent *Schisms* in the *Church*,  
"it could not attain its end, if any persons  
"were exempted from their jurisdiction. And  
"if it were in the *Popes* power to grant such  
"exemptions, it were by no means expedient  
"to do it, because the order of the *Church* would  
"be destroyed by it, the *Bishops* contemned,  
"and the *Church* divided; and if the *Monas-  
"tick Orders* paid no obedience to the *Bishops*,  
"the people would soon learn by their exam-  
"ple, to disobey them too. And supposing  
"it had been expedient before, it could not  
"be so then; because, though the *Monastick  
"orders* were founded in a *state of porverty*, yet  
"now those who were in them were arrived  
"at such a height of intolerable pride and  
"arrogance, that not only their *Abbots* and  
"Priors,

“*Priors*, but the *Fryers* thought themselves  
 “equal to *Bishops*, and fit to be preferred be-  
 “fore other *Ecclesiastical persons*. Thus far  
*Durandus*: and *Aegidius Romanus* at the same  
 time writ a Book, against the *Exemptions* of  
*Fryers*; against both of them, *Jacobus* the  
*Abbot* of the *Cistercians* writ a defence of *Ex-*  
*emptions*; which was published in *Vienna*, in  
 the time of the *Council*. This matter was  
 hotly debated in that *Council*, but the *Pope*  
 would not yield to the revocation of them: but  
 renews a *Bull* of *Boniface* 8. for qualifying and  
 composing the differences, that had happened  
 to the great scandal of the *Church* about them:  
 “wherein he takes notice of several *Bulls* be-  
 “fore, which had taken no effect (so excellent  
 “an instrument of peace is the *Pope's Antho-*  
 “*rity*) and that of a long time, a most grievous  
 “and dangerous discord had been between the  
 “*Bishops* and *Parochial Clergy*, on one part;  
 “and the *Preaching Fryers*, on the other.  
 “Therefore the *Pope* very wisely considering,  
 “how full of danger, how prejudicial to the  
 “*Church*, how displeasing to God, so great a dis-  
 “cord was; and resolving, wholly to remove  
 “it for the future, by his *Apostolical* authority  
 “doth appoint and command, that the *Fryers*  
 “should have liberty to Preach in all *Churches*,  
 “Places, and publick Streets at any other  
 “hour, but that wherein the *Bishops* did Preach,  
 “or did command others to Preach; with-  
 “out a particular license to Preach then: A  
 greater instance of the discords which have  
 been in the *Roman Church*, nor of the insuffi-

*Clemens* 14.  
 l. 3. c. 2.

ciency of the *Popes* Authority for the cure of them, can hardly be produced, than this is. The *Popes* were forced to say and unsay, and retract their own grants, to mitigate and qualify them and all to no purpose; for the differences continued as great, notwithstanding them. The first *Pope*, who interposed in this quarrel, was *Gregory 9.* who upon complaint made by the *Fryers*, of the *Bishops* exercising their jurisdiction over them in several things, mentioned as grievances by them; he publishes two *Bulls* or decretal *Epistles*, to forbid the *Bishops* doing it for the future: upon this the *Fryers* openly condemn the *Bishops*, and Preach where they please, and hear confessions, and bury the dead in spite of them, and the *Parochial Clergy* *Innocent 4.* finding how necessary their help was to him, in the Controversies between him and the *Emperour*, confirms the same privileges to them: by which they grew so insolent, that they called the *Parish Priests*, as *Matthew Paris* relates, *Ideots, Dunces, Drunkards, Blind guides*, and would make the people believe, that all knowledge and sanctity was only among them: insomuch, that in *Petrus de Vincis*, who lived in that Age and was Chancellor to the *Emperour*, we read a miserable complaint of the *Parochial Clergy* against the *Fryers*, viz. that by their means they were brought under the greatest contempt, to the general scandal of Religion; they expressing the most bitter hatred against them imaginable, reproaching their lives, and lessening their dues so, as they were brought to nothing by it; and they were

*Gregor. decret. Epistol.*  
l. 5. n. 31.  
c. 16, 17.

*Matth Paris A. D.*  
1235. p.  
419.

*Petrus de Vincis epistol. lib. 1.*  
cp. 37.

made a laughing stock, to all people, that they took away the main of their employment from them, and drew away the People from the Churches to the Convents, telling them the word of God was to be heard only among them. That they had nothing now left to do, but to pull down their Churches; in which they had scarce any thing left, besides a Bell and an old rusty Image; but these holy Fryers, while they had nothing, possessed all things, and professing poverty were extremely rich. But Innocent 4. a little before his death, being wearied by the complaints of the Bishops and Clergy, revoked the privileges which he had so largely granted to the Fryers, and confined them within certain limits; forbidding them, to draw away the people from their Parish Churches, upon Sundays and Holy days; or to admit any to penance, who had not first confessed to their Parish-priest: but the Fryers were as far from being pacified by this, as the Clergy were by the former; for therein the Pope upbraids them, with violating the rights of others, with blaspheming Religion by such actions, displeasing God, and drawing the souls of the faithful to perdition: but he dying, as soon as they had notice of this Bull, they said, it was a just judgement of God upon him, for revoking their privileges. And Alexander 4. was no sooner settled in his Chair, but they procured another Bull from him, to call in that of Innocent 4. and immediately to suspend all execution of it; but this did not satisfy them, for they boasted they had killed Pope Innocent by their Prayers, and that the

*Sculon  
quintus  
universi.  
Parif. p.  
271.*



D'attichy  
 bish. Cardi-  
 nal. Tom. I.  
 vit. snibal-  
 di. Rainald  
 ad. A. D.  
 1254. n. 73.  
 Boulay. bi-  
 stor. univer-  
 sit. Paris.  
 tom. 3. p.  
 176.  
 Id. p. 462

*V. Mary, every time they invocated her name, turn-  
 ed to her Son and said, Son hear them: upon  
 which Innocent was presently struck with a Pal-  
 sie and dyed; from whence arose a saying in  
 the Court of Rome, from the Fryers Litanies  
 good Lord deliver us. This is related as true by  
 Bzovius, ad A. D. 1254. but is looked on as a  
 fable of the Fryers, by D'attichy, Raynaldus,  
 du Boulay and others of any judgement among  
 them. But neither this Bull of Alexander, nor  
 all the rest he made for their sakes, could make  
 the Bishops and the Clergy give up their rights;  
 for in the time of Martin 4. the Fryers procured  
 another Bull, for bearing Confessions without li-  
 cense from the Bishops; upon which, the con-  
 tention increased between the Bishops and the  
 Fryers; insomuch, that not waiting the Popes  
 revocation of his grant, which he was inclined  
 to by the perswasions of the Bishop of Amiens,  
 they called a Synod of the Gallican Church at  
 Paris, A. D. 1284. wherein the Arch-Bishop  
 of Bourges being president, declared to them,  
 "that being Pastors of the flock, they ought  
 "to lay down their lives for their sheep, and  
 "not to suffer the encroachments were made  
 "upon them by the Fryers; by whom, all  
 "things were brought to confusion in the  
 "Church: that they had used all fair ways  
 "of prevailing with them, by the intreaties  
 "of the King and Nobles, to forbear such  
 "intrusions into their offices, as they were  
 "continually guilty of; but all to no purpose,  
 "they still defending themselves by Papal pri-  
 "viledges, whereas there had been contrary  
 "Bulls*

"Bulls to one another granted at Rome. And it was then agreed among them, that they should maintain their own office against the Fryers incroachments; by which the contention increased to so great a height, that many *invektives*, *Apologies*, and *libels* were published one against another, to the great disgrace (saith *Meyerus*) of the whole Ecclesiastical Order. Upon which, Pope Martin endeavoured an accommodation by another Bull, wherein he required, that all Parishioners should Confess to their own Parish Priest, at least once a year. But this was as far from making peace, as any before; therefore from Boniface 8. the Fryers procured a new Bull of privileges, which absolutely nulls all the former Bulls of restriction and limitation; and by the fulness of his Apostolical power, doth exempt them from all manner of power or jurisdiction of the Bishops, or any other Ecclesiastical persons; and decrees, that they were immediately subject to the Pope, and to none else. And yet this Pope himself, not many years after, retracted this Bull; and set forth that, which Clement 5. renewed in order to the composing this difference, which had now, to the great demonstration of their Unity and the Popes Authority, continued with great violence above fifty years: and was far from being ended by this Bull; for Benedict 11. in another, published on the same occasion, saith, that instead of peace, troubles arose by it; instead of unity and concord, greater divisions and disturbances: and by cutting off one head of the Hydra, seven more came up in its room. Are not

*Meyer. Annales Flandr. l. 10. ad A.D. 1285.*

*Extravagant. c. 1. tit. 7. c. 1.*

the Popes great *Peace-makers*, the mean while! Therefore he resolves, to try what the other way would do; and again enlarges the privileges of the *Fryers*; which being found as unsuccessful as ever *Clement 5.* resumes the *Constitution* of *Boniface*, which this *Pope* condemned; and to as little purpose, as the other had done before. And now let us soberly consider, whether there hath not always been an admirable *Unity* in the *Roman Church*; or if divisions have arose, a ready means to suppress them? Here we have the *Popes* interposing, by *Bull* after *Bull*; and so far from ending the differences that occasioned them, that they begot more, which made the *Popes* contradict one another, nay the same *Pope* to contradict himself; and so the differences became greater, than they were at first. And after all these *Bulls*, we find the very same *Controversie* at as great a height in *England*, and *Ireland* as ever it had been in *France*, or *Germany*; *Wadding* saith, it went so high, that the *Bishops* and *Clergy* here would not suffer the *Fryers* to enjoy any of the privileges, granted them by the *Popes*: which caused an appeal to the *Pope*, made by the *Fryers*; to whom, in behalf of the *Clergy*, was sent *Richard Fitz. Ralph*, the learned *Bishop* of *Armagh*, best known by the name of *Armachanus*; who there, with great smartness, opposed the *Fryers* to the *Popes* face, in a long and set discourse still extant; wherein he gives an account, "that coming to *London*, about some business of "his *See*, he found great disputes about the privileges of the *Fryers*; and being desired to "Preach,

*Wadding.*

*Aenal. Mib.*

*1 D. 1357.*

*Rich. Fitz. Ralph.*

“ Preach , he made seven or eight Sermons,  
 “ wherein he declared his mind against them,  
 “ both as to their Order , and Priviledges ; in  
 “ which he followed the doctrine of the Di-  
 “ vines at *Paris*, above an hundred years before  
 “ delivered by them , upon the like occasion ;  
 “ asserting it not to be in the Popes power, to  
 “ grant such priviledges which destroy the  
 “ rights of the *Parochial Clergy*, or the *juris-*  
 “ *dition* of the *Bishops*. The *Fryers* charge him *Bule. hist.*  
 with *Heresie* , as they are wont to do those who *universit.*  
 are wiser than themselves , saith *Boulay* : *Arma-* *Paristom.4.*  
*chanus* dyed at *Avignon* , but so did not the *p. 337.*  
*Controversie* with him ; although the *Fryers*  
 seem to have had the better there, they being  
 the *Popes Janisaries*, and ready in all places to  
 serve his turn ; yet *Walsingham* saith, it was not *Walsingham*  
 without corrupting the *Popes Court*, by great bri- *hist. Angel.*  
 bes given by the *Fryers*, that they obtained the *in Edu. 3.*  
 confirmation of their priviledges ; yet seven years *p. 173.*  
 after , *Harspsfield* saith, this *Controversie* was re-  
 ferred to the *Parliament* to be determined. Very  
 strange ! that a *Parliament* in *England* should  
 be thought a more likely means for *Unity* in  
 the *Church*, than the *Authority* of so many *Popes*,  
 who had interposed in it, for putting an issue  
 to this difference. After *Armachanus Wick-*  
*liffe* undertook this quarrel against the *Fryers* ,  
 and made use of the same arguments against  
 them, which those who defended the *Clergy*  
 had done before. For in his Book against the *Joh. Wick-*  
*Orders* of *Fryers* , he particularly insists upon *liffe against*  
 this, That they for pride and covetise had drawn *the Orders*  
 fro *Curats* there Office and *Sacraments*, in which *of Fryers*  
 c. 10. p. 28.  
 !yen

lyen winning or worship; and so maken dissension, betwixt Curats and their Ghostlie Childer. Which are his own words. But Wickliff and his Disciples carrying the Controversies much farther, to points of doctrine and other practices in the Roman Church, made the other parties more quiet, out of opposition to these whom they looked on as their common enemies. It may be therefore they will say, that although the Popes Pastoral power may not always cure their divisions, yet the opposition of Hereticks makes them run together like a flock of sheep; if this were true, it seems they are more beholding to Hereticks for their Unity, than to the Popes Authority: but we shall find that neither one nor the other of these, nor both together, can keep them from divisions; and those managed with as great animosity, as we have ever found in the most differing Sects.

Of the differences between the regulars and seculars in England.

Watsons  
Reply to  
Parsons his  
Libel. p. 2.

§. 9. Witness the proceedings between the Jesuits and the Secular Priests, begun in Wisbech Castle, in the latter end of Q. Elizabeths Reign; when it came to a separation from each other, about the authority of the Arch-Priests. And they mutually charged each other, with being guilty of a horrible Schism, maintained saith Watson, by the Jesuits and Arch-Priests, with infinite violence, much infamy for the time, and innumerable particular wrongs thereupon, not unknown to the meanest Catholick in England. The secular Priests finding themselves unjustly accused, as they said, to the Pope, published a Book in Latin which they Dedicated

ed to his *Holiness*, called *declaratio motuum & turbarum*; which, saith Parsons in his answer called, *A manifestation of the great folly and bad spirit of certain in England calling themselves secular Priests*; "is made up only of invectives, and passionate words, injurious, and manifest false slanders; they in their Reply charge Parsons with *folly and madness*, and the *highest degree of impudencie*. If any one hath a mind to furnish himself, with all the terms and phrases of scolding, reproach and infamy, he may find them in the Books they then writ against each other; or if he thinks that too great a trouble, he may meet with a goodly parcel of them put together, out of *Fa. Parsons* his own writings, by *Watson*, at the end of the *Reply to Parson's Libel*. The short account of the breach among them was this; all the loud talk they made abroad concerning their cruel persecution, could not hinder ambition, and envy from having its effects among them, from these, first arose misunderstandings, and then quarrels, between the *secular Priests* and the *Jesuits*; from thence, the Priests proceeded to the forming a *sodality*, (as they called it) among themselves, the better to strengthen themselves against the *Jesuits*; which they understanding prevail with one of the number of the *associated Priests*, to betray their Councils; him they send to Rome, who in the name of all the *Priests* in England desired, for the preventing differences for the future, and the curing those that were already, that there might be a *Government and subordination* settled among



among them. *Fa. Parsons*, being then at *Rome*, follows the matter close; and represents to the *Pope* the necessity of it, because of the great discords which were among them in *England*. Whereupon the *Pope*, according to *Fa. Parsons* desire, refers the whole business to *Cardinal Cajetan*, their *Protector*. Who being governed by the *Jesuits* pitched upon a person wholly at their devotion (as the *seculars* thought) which was *Blackwell*, a man swayed altogether by *Garner*, Provincial of the *Jesuits*; (well known for his zeal in the *Catholick cause*, by suffering as one of their *Martyrs* in the *Gunpowder Treason*) and one of the *Arch-Priests* instructions was, in all matters of moment, to be advised by the Provincial of the *Jesuits*. The *secular Priests*, finding themselves thus overreached by the cunning of the *Jesuits*, and that they designed hereby wholly to govern their affairs; make many demurrs to his Authority; both concerning the manner, and the substance of it: and desire a *Breve* from the *Pope*, and then promise to submit. *Parsons* procures one to their purpose, and an appearance of peace was for a little time among them; and they mutually promised not to charge the *Schism* upon each other; but within a month or six weeks, the flame brake out with greater fury than ever, the *Arch-Priest* sending his directions into all parts, that none of the *Seculars* should be admitted to the *Sacraments* without acknowledging themselves *Schismatics*. So that the *Popes Breve* was so far from ending the difference, that it encreased it; *Fa. Parsons* charging them,

them, ( and the *Seculars* not denying it ) that after it, they were farther from obeying the *Arch-Priest*, than they were before. So unhappy have the *Popes* been, when they have gone about to use their *Authority* for composing differences, among those who are in their own *Church*?

But we leave this, and come to a later controverſie among them, about the ſame matters of Order and Government. *Richard Smith*, titular *Bishop* of *Chalcedon*, was inveſted with the *Authority* of *Ordinary*, over their *Engliſh Clergy* by *Urban* 8. *Febr.* 4. *A. D.* 1625. not long after, he comes into *England*; and was received with ſo great kindneſs by their party here, as made the *Jefuits* ( who are friends to none, but themſelves ) ſoon to become his enemies, eſpecially when he began to exerciſe his *Episcopall* *jurisdiction* here, in lying reſtraints upon the *Regulars*; which the *Jefuits* with other *Regulars* grew ſo impatient of, that they ſoon revived the old quarrel, concerning the *authority* and *jurisdiction* of *Bishops*; and managed it with ſo great heat and fierceneſs, that the titular *Bishop* was fain to leave the field, and withdraw into *France*. The bottom of the quarrel was, they found the kindneſs of their party to them abated, ſince the *Bishops* coming; who before had ſway'd all, and lived in great plenty and bravery; when the poor *Seculars* got ſcarce bread to eat, as *Watſon* very ſadly laments, in his answer to *Parſons*; but now the neceſſary ſupport of the dignity of a *Bishop*, made the charity of  
their

their party run in another chanel; which the *Provincial* of the *Jesuits* complains of, in a Letter to the *Bishop* of *Chalcedon*. Therefore they endeavour all they can to make a party against him, among the people too; which they did so effectually, as amounted to his withdrawing, a more civil word for his exile. And now; both parties being sufficiently heated, the battel begins, in which not only *England* and *Ireland*, but *France* and *Flanders*, were deeply engaged. The first who appeared was *Dr. Kelifon*, *Professour* of *Doway*, in a Book in *Vindication* of the *Bishops* Authority; to whom *Knot*, then *Vice-principal* of the *Jesuits*, returned his *Modest and brief discussion*, &c. under the name of *Nicholas Smith*; a *Jesuite* then dead. Soon after came out another, written to the same purpose; under the name of *Daniel of Jesu*, whose true name was *John Fluide* (which the other, writing *Joanes* for *John*, was the *Anagram* of,) he was a *Jesuite* too, and *Professour* at *St. Omars*: which Books, were first centured by the *Arch-Bishop* of *Paris*, then by the *Sorbonne*, and at last by the *Bishops* of *France*, in an *Assembly* of them at *Paris*: but the *Jesuites* were so far from giving over by this, that they set forth their Books again in *Latin*, with large approbations of them; and publish a *Remonstrance* against the *Bishop* of *Chalcedon*; in the name of the *Catholick* party in *England*; which was disowned by the greatest number of them, and cast wholly upon the *Jesuites*: the same year, 1631. three Books were published by the *secular Clergy* here, in opposition

to the *Jesuits*. Who were so far from quitting the Field by reason of the number of their enemies, that they begin a fresh charge against both the *Sorbonne Doctors* and the *French Clergy*, under the fained name of *Hermannus Loe-melius*, whose chief Author was the fore-named *Jesuite Lloyd* with the assistance of his Brethren, as the diversity of the style shews: and another Book came out against the *Faculty of Paris*, in *Vindication of Knot or Nicholas Smith*, with many approbations of *Bishops, Universities*, and *private Doctors*: and in *Vindication of the Propositions of Ireland* (likewise censured at *Paris*) another Book came forth, under the name of *Edmundus Ursulanus*, whose true name was *Mac-mhaone*, Prior of the *Franciscan Covent in Louvain*. About the same time, the *Jesuits* published their *Censure of the Apostolical Creed*, in imitation of the *censures at Paris*, against their Doctrine (as though their *Doctrines* were as certain as that, and themselves as *infallible* as the *Apostles* :) wherein they charge the *Bishops* their enemies, with reviving old *Heresies*, and broaching new ones. The *Jesuits* having now done such great things, triumph unreasonably in all places, as having utterly overthrown their enemies, and beaten them out of the field: when, in a little time after, *Hallier* and *le Maistre*, two *Doctors of the Sorbonne*, undertake the quarrel against them; but none was so highly magnified and infinitely applauded by the *French Clergy*, as a person under the disguised name of *Petrus Aurelius*; whose achievements in this kind they celebrate, next to

to those of the *Pucelle d' Orleans*; and Printed all these Works together, at their own charge; and writ a high *Elogium* of him, which is prefixed before them. And the *secular Clergy* of *England* sent him a letter of Congratulation for his Triumphs, subscribed by *John Colleton* Dean of the Chapter, and *Edmond Dutton* Secretary; wherein, they sadly lament the discords that have been among them here, and the *Heresies* broached by their Adversaries, by occasion of them. The main of this Controversie did concern the *dignity, necessity, and jurisdiction* of the *Episcopal Order*; as appears by the Censures of the *Bishops of France*, and by *Aurelius*, who saith, "that although the Dispute began upon occasion of the *Bishop of Chalcedon*, and the English Clergy, yet it was now carried farther, whether the *Episcopal Order* was necessary to the Being of a particular Church? Whether it was by *divine right*, or no? Whether confirmation might be given, without *Bishops*? Whether the *Episcopal Order* was more perfect, than the *Monastical*? Whether the *Regulars* were under the jurisdiction of *Bishops*? And therefore the *Jesuits* are charged by their *Adversaries*, with a design to extirpate and ruine the whole *Order of Episcopacy*. Have not these men now great reason to insult over us, that some of these questions have caused great differences among us; when the *Jesuits* in *England* had laid the foundation of them, by their quarrels of the same kind, but a little before; and furnished the enemies to *Episcopacy* and the Church of *England*,

Petri Aurelii opera  
tom. I p. 62.

England, with so many arguments to their hands; to manage their bad cause with? But what becomes of the *Court of Rome*, all this while? do the *Pope* and *Cardinals* only stand still, to see what the issue of the Battel will be, without ever offering to compose the difference between the two parties? No. The *Jesuits*, finding how hard they were put to it, make their address to *Rome*, as their greatest *Sanctuary*, and A. D. 1633. obtained a *Decree* of the *Sacred Congregation*, for suppressing the Books on both sides, without judging any thing at all of the merits of the cause, or giving any *censure* of the authority on either side. And is not now the *Pope's* authority an excellent remedy, for all divisions in the Church? When in so great a heat as this was, the *Pope* durst not interpose at all in the main business, for fear of losing either side; which is a plain argument, that they themselves look on his Authority as so precarious a thing, that they must by no means expose it, where it is like to be called in *Question*. Were not her *Controversies* fit to be determined? To what purpose is that authority, that dare not be exercised when there is most need of it? and when could there be greater need, than in such a time, when the Church was in a flame by these contentions? And yet so timerous a *Decree* as this was, could find no acceptance. For at *Paris* immediately comes out a *disquisition* upon it, "shewing the unreasonableness of it, in suppressing Books without enquiring into the merits of the cause, in a matter of so great consequence as

D d

"that



" that was; that this would give great occasion  
 " of triumph to the Hereticks, when such  
 " scandalous and seditious Books, as those of  
 " the Jesuites are, meet with the same favour at  
 " Rome, with the censure of the *Bishops* of  
 " France: that their *profane* and *Atheistical Cen-*  
 " *sure* of the *Apostles Creed* must have no mark  
 " of disgrace put upon it; nor such sayings  
 " of theirs, wherein they call the *Bishops*  
 " and *Divines* of France by most contumelious  
 " names, and say they are the enemies of the  
 " truth and piety. The *Jesuites*, instead of de-  
 " fending themselves against *Aurelius*, write a  
 " pitiful defence of this Decree, of suppressing  
 " the Books on both sides; and so all the means,  
 " which the *Court* of Rome durst use to extin-  
 " guish this flame, proved but an occasion of ad-  
 " ding to it. And whether this Controversie be  
 " yet at an end among them, let all the heats in  
 " France and England of late years concerning  
 " the *Jesuites* give testimony.

Of the Je-  
 suites par-  
 ticular op-  
 position to  
 Bishops  
 and their  
 Authority.

§. 10. I shall not now insist any longer up-  
 on them, but only produce some late pas-  
 sages of things (which though they happen-  
 ed at a greater distance, are yet sufficiently  
 attested) to shew what spight the *Jesuitical Or-*  
*der* bears, to the *Authority* of *Bishops*, what  
 arts they have used to enervate it, what power  
 to affront their persons, and to expose them to  
 all the contempt that may be, when they go  
 about to stop their proceedings, or exercise  
 any jurisdiction over them. The great occa-  
 sion of the Controversie between the *Bishops*  
 and them was, that the *Jesuits* took upon them

to Preach, and hear Confession, &c. without any permission from the *Bishop* of the *Diocess*. So they did in the *Philippine Islands*, whereupon the *Archbishop* of *Manille*, *Don Aernando Guerrero* called a Synod; whercin it was resolved, that the *Archbishop* ought to bring the *Jesuits* to account for what they did; which he did, and all the satisfaction he could get from them was, *that they had priviledges*; the *Archbishop*, not satisfied with this, proceeds against them; they name a *Conservator* an enemy of the *Archbishops*, (For the *Popes* to keep the *Bishops* in awe, have allowed them, by a *Bull* for that purpose, liberty in case of difference between the *Bishops* and them, to choose a *Conservator*, to defend their priviledges against them) this *Conservator* proceeds against the *Archbishop*, and the *Jesuits* procure the Governor to joyn with him; who, without giving leave to him to make his Defence, resolve to banish him. The *Archbishop*, understanding their resolution to send him away, goes with the *Clergie* about him into his *Chappel*; and there, to secure himself from the insolence of the *Souldiers*, in his *Pontifical habit*, holds the *Eucharist* in his hand: notwithstanding which, they came and dragged out all the *Fryers*, who took the *Archbishops* part; and afterwards, the old *Archbishop* himself, who fell down in the crowd with the *Pix* in his hand, and wounded himself in the face. Such exorbitances made that impression on one of the *Souldiers*, that he drew his sword, and falling upon it said, *He had rather dye by his own hands, than see such enormities*

Moral practice of the *Jesuits*.  
p. 328.

*Bull. Rom.*  
*Tom. 2. p.*  
*361. Bull. i.*  
*Greg. 13.*

among Christians. At last, the Arch-bishop was forced to let go his *Pix*; and was presently carryed away out of the City; and put into a little pitiful Barque; unprovided of all things, without permitting any food to be given him, or any of his servants to accompany him; and was conveyed by five Souldiers into a Desert Island, where he had not so much as a Cabin for shelter; and there he was kept, till he yielded to their terms. O the admirable unity, peace, and submission to Bishops in the Roman Church! But we have yet a more remarkable instance of this kind, in the notorious case of the difference between the Bishop of *Angolopolis* in *America*, and the *Jesuits*; which was heard at *Rome*, and several Bulls published by *Innocent 10.* in it. I shall give an account of it, from the *Popes Bulls*, and from the letter which the Bishop himself sent to the Pope about it, *A. D. 1649.* which is extant in the Collection at the end of *Mr. S. Amours Journal*; which he had from *Cosimo Ricciardi* Sub-library-keeper of the *Vatican*, who received it immediately from the *Bishops Agent*. The controvertie began there upon the very same grounds, which it had done in the *Philippine Islands*; for the *Jesuits* would acknowledge no subjection at all to the Bishop, but would Preach and hear Confessions, without any license from the Bishop; which difference grew so high, that the *Jesuits* chose *Conservators*, against the Bishops authority; as the *Popes Bull* granted, *May 14. A. D. 1648.* doth declare; and not only so, but these *Conservators* very fairly

Collection  
of Tracts.  
p. 11.

excommunicated the *Bishop* and his *Vicar General* : upon this, the *Bishop* sends an *Agent* to *Rome*, and the *Jesuits* appear in behalf of their *Society* ; the *Pope* commits the cause, to a particular Congregation of *Cardinals* and *Bishops* ; who, upon the hearing of both sides, give sentence in favour of the *Bishop*, Apr. 16. A.D. 1648. But the *Jesuits*, (as appears by the *Bishops* letter, bearing date, Jan. 8. A.D. 1649.) were resolved not to wait, for the *Popes* resolution ; but finding that the people contemned their censures, and adhered to the *Bishop*, were so enraged at it, that they resolved to imprison him : to that end, they bribe the *King of Spains Vice-roy*, the *Bishops* particular enemy, with a great sum of money ; and by that means clapt up most of his Friends, and threatned them with worse, if they would not obey the *Conservators*, the *Bishop* himself they had appointed Souldiers to seize upon, on *Corpus Christi* day, (the better day, the better deed ) who understanding their minds, sent commissioners to treat with them, to prevent the tumults and disorders were like to follow on these differences ; but they used them with contempt, and would hear of no terms, unless the *Bishop* would submit himself, and his jurisdiction, to them and their *Conservators* ; but instead of peace they proceed to more open acts of hostility, by imprisoning his *Vicar General*, and using all manner of insolencies among the *People*, who joyned with the *Bishop* to defend him against them. The good *Bishop*, seeing things in so bad a posture, thought it his greatest pro-

dence to withdraw to the mountains, thinking himself safer, among the *Serpents* and *Scorpions* there, than in the City among the *Jesuits*. There he continues for twenty dayes, almost famished ; and afterwards, for four months lay hid in a pitiful Cottage ; the *Jesuits*, in the mean time, offering great sums of money to those, who should bring him alive or dead. But not finding him, they bring the excommunicated *Conservators* with great pomp into the City ; and erect a *Tribunal*, or in the language of the late times, a *High Court of Justice* among them ; where according to their pleasure they fine, banish, imprison as many as they thought their enemies ; and there solemnly declare, what mighty injury the *Bishop* had done the *Jesuits*, in forbidding them to Preach without *licenses* from him, or till such time as they produced those, which they had from his Predecessors : then they declare the *Bishops See* to be vacant ; and caused it to be published in the *Churches*, that the *Jesuits* did not need any license from the *Bishop* ; they null all censures against them, recall all Orders published by the *Bishop*, for the good Government of his *Diocess*. The *Bishop* in the mean time privately sends monitory *letters* to the people, to bear the present persecution with patience, but by no means to associate with, or to hear those excommunicated persons, who had offered such affronts to his authority and jurisdiction ; by which means, the people not being prevailed upon, they with a great sum of money procure some Secular *Judges*, to form a judicial Process

Process against the *Bishop* for *Sedition*; to which end, they suborn witnesses against him, but could make evidence of nothing tending to sedition, but forbidding the *Jesuits* to Preach. This not taking, they attempt another way, to expose him to contempt; upon the Sacred day of their holy *Father Ignatius*, they put their Scholars in *Masquerade*, and so personating the *Bishop* and his *Clergy*, they make a procession through the *Town*, in the middle of the day, and sung the *Pater noster* and *Ave Maria* as they went, with horrible blasphemies perverting both of them to the abuse of the *Bishop* and his party; instead of saying *libera nos à malo*, they said *libera nos à Palafox*, which was the name of the *Bishop*: and others had the *Episcopal staffe* hanging at a Horse rail, and the *Miter* on their stirrups, to let them see how much they had it under their feet: others sung *Lampoons* against the *Bishop*, others did such things which are not fit to be repeated: Which were parts of this glorious triumph of the *Jesuits* over the *Bishop* and his *Authority*. But in the midst of this excessive jollity, the *King of Spains Navy* arrived, wherein the *Kings* commands were brought for removing the *Vice-Roy*, who was the great Friend of the *Jesuits*, the news of this, abated their heat, and the *Bishop* secretly conveys himself into his *Palace*, which the people hearing of, ran with incredible numbers to embrace him, for several dayes together; upon which the *Jesuits* complain to the old *Vice-Roy* of a sedition, and obtained from him a command to the *Chapter*, not to



yield to the *Bishops* Jurisdiction; which caused a great division among them, one part adhering to the *Bishop*, and another to the *Jesuits*; the *Bishop* therefore, seeing the differences to rise higher, and the *Schism* to be greater, and the miserable condition the *Church* was in among them, was fain to submit, and promise to innovate nothing, but to wait the *Popes* decision. Not long after, another ship arrived from *Spain*, with an *Express* from the *King*, wherein the *Vice-Roy* was commanded immediately to surrender his *Government*; and was severely rebuked, for assisting the *Jesuits* against the *Bishop*; and all the acts in that matter were nulled by the *Kings* authority; but the *Jesuits*, according to their usual integrity, gave out just the contrary to the Orders received, and framed Letters on purpose, which they dispersed among the people. But these arts never holding long, when the *Vice-Roy's* Successor was established, the truth brake forth; and the *Bishop* returned to the exercise of his former Authority.

But notwithstanding the *Kings* Declaration, and the *Popes* Breve was now published among them, the *Jesuits* persisted still in their obstinate disobedience, and, although excommunicated by the *Bishop*, yet continued to Preach and act as before. And hereby we have a plain discovery, what a mighty regard the *Jesuits* have to the *Papal* See, if it once oppose their designs; and what an effectual instrument of Peace and Unity the *Popes* Authority is; for they presently found wayes enough, to decline,

decline the force of the *Popes Bull*. For,  
( 1. ) They said, it could have no force there,  
because it was not received by the *Council* of  
the *Indies*, it seems, *pasce oves*, and *dabo tibi*  
*claves*, &c. signifie nothing in the *Indies*, unless  
the *Kings Council* pleases, or rather, unless the  
*Jesuits* please to let it do so. ( 2. ) They pleaded  
bravely for themselves, that the *priviledges*  
granted them by the *Popes* were in considerati-  
on of their merits, and so were of the nature  
of *contracts* and *Covenants*; and therefore could  
not be revoked by the *Pope*. ( 3. ) That the  
*Popes constitutions* in this matter were not re-  
ceived by the *Church*, and *Laws* which are not  
received are no *Laws*: But as the Bishop well  
urges against them, if these wayes of interpret-  
ing the *Popes Bulls* be allowed, his *Authority*  
will signifie nothing, and all his *Constitutions*  
shall have no more force, than those against  
whom they are directed be pleased to yield to  
them; and it will be impossible to preserve  
peace in the *Church*, if it shall be in the power of  
offenders to declare, whether the *Laws* against  
them are to be received for *Laws* or no. But  
this, saith he, is the *inspiration and illumination* of  
the *Jesuits*, and their *method of interpreting the*  
*Papal constitutions*; which he heard very often  
from their own mouths, in the frequent confe-  
rences he had with them, about these matters;  
But they had another way, to decline the *Kings*  
*Authority*; for the *King* and his *Council* being  
all *Lay-men*, they had nothing to do in  
*Ecclesiastical matters*. By which means ( as the  
*Bish p* saith, ) they make themselves superiour  
both

both to *King* and *Pope*, and free from all jurisdiction, either *spiritual* or *temporal*. And I dare appeal to the most indifferent person, whether any Doctrine broached by the greatest Fanatics among us, ever tended more to the dissolution of *Government*, the countenancing sedition, the perpetuating *Schisms* in the *Church*, than these of the *Jesuits* do? And therefore the *Bishop* saith, that he had rather lay down his life, than by yielding up his jurisdiction expose his authority to Contempt, and the *Church* to the continual danger of *Schisms*; and by many weighty arguments perswades the *Pope*, if he truly designed the peace and flourishing of the *Church*, speedily and effectually to reform the whole Order of the *Jesuites*; without which, he saith, it is impossible, especially in those remote parts, for the *Bishops* to preserve any Authority. And, besides other corruptions among them, he tells strange stories, of their wayes of propagating *Christian Religion* in *China*, and other neighbour Nations; which they boast so much of at this distance; but, he saith, they who are so much nearer and understand those things better, have cause to lament the infinite scandals which they give to the *Christian Religion*, in doing it. The account which he gives of these things, this *Bishop* protests he sends to the *Pope*, only to clear his own Conscience; that he might not be condemned at the day of judgement, for concealing that which he so certainly knew to be true, from those who were eye-witnesses of it. Their first work is, to hinder all persons,

of any other Order whatsoever, from coming among them ; and if they do come, by one means or other, they are sure to procure their banishment and persecution ; to this end, they assist and counsel the *Infidels* themselves in it, and make use of their hands to whip and imprison them, and so to make them weary of being there. When they are left alone, they have the liberty of telling their own stories, and no one can disprove them ; but they were not so watchful, but some of the other Orders were sent as *Spyes* upon them ; and although they knew, they hazarded their lives in it, yet they made full discovery of the *Jesuits* way of converting *Infidels*. And they discovered such horrible things, in the *Catechisms* they gave to their new *Converts*, that they complained to the *Pope* of them ; but, as appears by the event, to very little purpose ; for although, the *Jesuits* could not deny the things they were charged with, and the *Congregation*, *de propagandâ fide*, at Rome, Sept. 12. A. D. 1645. in *seventeen Decrees* condemned them ; yet the *Rector* of the *Jesuits Colledge* in the *Philippines*, in a Book of 300 pages, opposed those *Decrees*, which was in the hands of the *Bishop* of *Angelopolis*, and he gave it to a *Dominican* to answer, who had been in those parts himself, who fully proved the matter of fact, and answered the *Jesuits* arguments, both which the *Bishop* saith, were in his custody. The short of their instructions to their *Converts* was this, to speak little of *Christ Crucified*. but to conceal that small and inconsiderable circumstance

stance of the *Christian Doctrine*, as much as may be ; to use all the same customes that the *Idolaters* did, only directing all their worship to Christ and the Saints ; not to trouble themselves about Fasting, Penance, Confession, and participation of the Eucharist, or the severity of Repentance and Mortification. They designed to recommend as easie a *Religion* to them as may be, the better to invite them to embrace it ; and therefore, as the *Bishop* observes, we read of no *Martyrs* among them: the poor *Dominicans* and *Franciscans* are whipt, and imprisoned, and banished ; but the *Jesuits*, who Preach only a glorious *Christ*, without his *passion* and *cross*, have far better and easier entertainment among them. But these things the *Bishop* there gives a larger account of : I return to the Controversie between the *Bishop* and them : An *Agent* was sent to *Rome* by the *Bishop* with this letter, to negotiate his business there against the *Jesuits* ; a man intelligent, vigorous and undaunted, saith Mr. *S. Amour* of him ; who followed his business so close, that after long solicitation and address, he obtains another *Decree* against the *Jesuits*, which is extant at large in the *Lyons* Edition of the *Bullarium* : but which ought to be observed, is since prohibited by the *Index Expurgatorius* of *Alexander 7.* by whose means that was procured, is easie to conjecture ; when we consider, with what difficulty the *Decree* was obtained ; and for above a year after the passing it, the coming of it forth was hindered by *Cardinal Spada* under-hand, who was a great Friend to the *Jesuits*. And when

*S. Amours*  
*Journal. p.*  
*5. ch. 15.*

*Index. Alex.*  
*A.D. 1658.*

when it did come forth, the *Jesuits* bought up all the *Copies* of it they could, on purpose to abolish the memory of it: which made them obtain the prohibition of the *Bullarium*, till that part were purged out of it. But if the *Popes* had any real kindness for the *Authority* of *Bishops*, they would never suffer such encroachments to be made upon them, as they do; nor shew so much favour, to the contemners of it. But this is one of the grand *Intrigues* of the *Roman Court*, to keep the *Bishops* down by the *priviledges* of the *Regulars*, who are immediate dependents on the *Popes*; only at some times, when they cannot help it, they must seem to curb them; but yet so, as to keep them in heart enough to bait the *Bishops*, when they begin to exercise their *Authority*, as they ought to do, in the reformation of abuses and disorders. But by these heats and controversies among them, about matters of *Government* and *Order*, it appears, that they have no cause to upbraid us, with our *dissensions* about them: And that they have no more effectual means to suppress them, than *We*.

§. II. 2. As to matters of doctrine. The least thing any one could imagine, by all the boasts of *Unity* among them, and their upbraiding others with their *dissensions*, is, that they are all of one mind, in matters of doctrine; but he must believe against common sense and experience, that can believe this. For we know their *divisions* well enough, and that it is as easie a matter to compose all the differences among us, as among them. We may  
affoon

*S. Amos's  
Journal.  
p. 7. ch. 5.*

Of their  
differences  
in matters  
of doctrine.



as soon persuade the *Quakers* to *Uniformity*, as reconcile the *Dominicans* and the *Jesuits*; and all our *Sects* will agree as soon, as the *factions* of the *Thomists* and *Scotists*; the *Presbyterians* and *Independents* will yield to *Episcopal jurisdiction*, as soon as the *Monastick Orders* will quit their *priviledges*; the *Arminians* and *Calvinists* will be all of a mind, when the *Jansenists* and *Molinists* are: and we are apt to think, that our *Controversies* about *Ceremonies* are not altogether of so great importance, as theirs about *Infallibility*. But it is a very pleasant thing to see, by what arts they go about to persuade credulous people, that what would be called *divisions* any where else, is an *admirable Union* among them; they might as soon persuade them, that the seven Hills of *Rome* are the *bottomless pit*, or that *contradictions* may be true. For either the *Pope* is infallible, or he is not; either the *supream Government* of the *Church*, is committed to him alone as *St. Peters* Successour, or to the representative *Church* in a *Council*; either he hath a temporal power to command *Princes*, or he hath not; either the *V. Mary* was conceived with *Original sin*, or she was not; either there is a *Pre-determination*, or there is not; either *Souls* may be delivered out of *Purgatory*, or they may not: Dare any of them say, they are all of a mind in the *Church* of *Rome* about these points? I am sure they dare not. But what then? do they not differ from one another? do they not write, and Preach, and rail against each other, as much

as any Sectaries can do? are there not factions of long continuance among them, upon these differences? where then lyes their *Unity* they boast off? Alas! we speak like Ignorant persons, and do not consider, what artificial men we have to deal with; who, with some pretty tricks and slights of hand, make all that which seems to us shattered and broken in pieces, to appear sound and entire, without the least crack or flaw in it. It will be worth the while, to find out these arts; for I do not question, but by a discreet managing them, they may serve us as well as them: and our Church will have, ( though not so much splendour ) yet as much *Unity* as theirs. They tell us therefore, that it is true they are not all of a mind, and it is not necessary to the *Unity of the Church* that they should be: but, they have the only way of composing differences; and they do not differ in matters of faith from each other; and their differences lye only in their Schools, and do not disturb the peace of the Church. This is the utmost I can find their best wits plead, for the *Unity of the Roman Church*; and if these be sufficient; I believe they and we will be proved to be as much at *Unity*, as they are among themselves.

1. They say, the *Unity of the Church* doth not lye in actual Agreement of the members of it, in matters of Doctrine; but in having the best means to compose differences, and to preserve consent; which is, submission to the Popes Authority. So Gregory de Valentia explains the *Unity of their Church*; for actual consent, he grants,

Greg. de  
Valent.  
Analys. fidei  
l. 6. c. 49.

may

may be in other Churches, as much as theirs; and there is nothing singular or peculiar attributed to their Church, supposing they were all of a mind, which it is plain they are not; but therein, saith he, lies the Unity of their Church, that they all acknowledge one Head, in whose judgement they acquiesce: and therefore, they have no more to do, but to know what the Pope determines. If this be all their Unity, we have greater than they; for we have a more certain way of ending Controversies, than they have: which I prove by an argument, like to one in great request among them, when they go about to perswade weak persons to their Religion; viz. that it must needs be safer to be in that Religion, wherein both parties agree a man may be saved; than in that, where one side denies a possibility of salvation; so say I here, that must be a safer way for Unity, which both parties agree to be infallible, than that which one side absolutely denies to be so; but both parties agree the Scriptures to be infallible, and all Protestants deny the Pope to be infallible; therefore ours is the more certain way for Unity. But this is not all; for it is far from being agreed among themselves, that the Pope is infallible; it being utterly denied by some among them, and the asserting it accounted *Herésie*: as is evident in some late Books written to that purpose, in France and England: What excellent means of Unity then is this among them; which it is accounted by some no less than *Herésie* to assert?

§. 13. But supposing they should yield the Pope that submission, which they deny to be due to him; yet how is his definition so much a more certain way of ending Controversies than the *Scriptures*? Let them name one Controversie that hath been ended in their Church, meerly by the *Popes Decrees*; so as the opposite party hath declared, that they believed contrary to what they believed before, on the account of the *Popes* definition. We have many instances to the contrary, wherein controversies have been heightened and increased by their interposing, but none concluded by them. Do they say the *Scripture* can be no means of *Unity*, because of the various *senses* which have been put upon it? and have they no wayes, to evade the *Popes* definitions? Yes, so many, that his *Authority* in truth signifies nothing, any farther than they agree that the upholding it tends to their common interest. But when once he comes to cross the interest of any party, if they do not in plain terms defie him, yet they find out more civil wayes, of making his *Definitions* of no force. Either they say, the *Decree* was procured by *fraud*, and the *Pope* made it by mis-information, which is the common way, or he did not define it as a *matter of faith*, sitting in *Cathedra*; or the *sense* of his definition is quite otherwise, than their *Adversaries* understand it; or supposing that be the sense, the *Pope* is never to be supposed to define any thing contrary to the *Scriptures* and *Fathers* and *ancient Canons*: Of all which it were no difficult task, to give late and particular instances;

The insufficiency of the *Popes* Authority for ending these differences.

but no one, who is acquainted with the history of that *Church*, can be ignorant of them; and the late proceedings, in the matter of the five *Propositions*, are a sufficient evidence of these things, to any one who reads them. For when was there a Fairer occasion given to the *Pope*, to shew his *Authority* for preservation of the *Churches* unity, than at that time, when the matter of the five *Propositions* was under debate at *Rome*: The same controverlie was now revived, which had disturbed their *Church* so often, and so much, before. In the time of *Clement 8.* the heats were so great between the *Jesuits* and *Dominicans*, that the *Pope* thought it necessary, for the peace of the *Church*, to put an end to them; to that end he appointed *Congregations*, for several years to discuss those points, that he might come to a resolution in them. This *Pope* at first was strangely preposset, by the arts of the *Jesuits*, against the *Dominicans*; but sending for the *General* of the *Dominicans*, he told him what sad apprehensions he had concerning the peace of the *Church*, by reason of the disputes between the *Jesuits* and them; and therefore charges him, that those of his *Order* should no longer molest the *Jesuits*, about these things; to whom he replied, that he assured him with as great Protestation as he was able, that it was no meer Scholastical dispute between them, but it was the cause of faith that was concerned, which he discoursed largely upon to the *Pope*, and made such impressions upon him, that the *Dominicans* verily believe, that had that *Pope* lived to the *Vespers* of *Penitecst* that year

*S. Amours*  
*Journal*  
 p. 3. ch. 10.  
*Journal*. p 6.  
 ch. 26. —  
 P. 3. ch. 8.

he

he dyed in *March*, he had published a *Bull* against the *Jesuits*, in presence of the *Colledge of Cardinals*, and created *F. Lemos Cardinal*. After his death, the congregations were continued in the time of *Paul 5.* but at last were broken up, without any decision at all. If the *Popes* determination be such an absolute *Instrument of peace* in the *Church*, it is the strangest thing in the world, it should be made so little use of, in such cases where they all acknowledge, it would be of infinite advantage to their *Church*, to have an issue put to such troublesome controversies as these were. But they know well enough, that the *Popes Authority* is the more esteemed, the less it is used, and that it hath alwayes been very hazardous to determine, where there have been considerable parties, on both sides; for fear the condemned party should renounce his *Authority*, or speak plainer truths than they are willing to hear. And therefore it was well observed by *Mons. S. Amour*, that *Journal* they are very jealous at Rome, of maintaining the *P. 1. ch. 9.* *Authority of the decrees which issue from thence; and that this consideration obliges the maker of them, to look very well to the compli- nce and facility that may be expected in their execution, before they pass any at all.* Which is a most certain argument they dare not trust the *Popes infallibility*, nor all the promises they pretend *Christ* hath made to their *Church*; but govern their affairs wholly by the rules of *humane Policy*. And on this account, when the heats brake forth in *France*, about *Jansenism*; and both parties made application to the *Court of Rome*, the *Pope*



*Journal*  
p 6. ch 3.  
Part 6. ch.  
13.

could never be prevailed with, to suffer the main controversies to be touched, or any decree to pass about them; but at last condemned some ambiguous *Propositions*, as taken out of *Jansenius* his Book; which both parties condemned according to their different senses, and they were left to dispute it out, which sense it was the *Pope* meant them in. And therefore the *Jansenists Advocate*, who was well versed in the practices of the *Court of Rome*, gave them the truest account of the intentions of that *Court*, in their affairs; which was, to delude both the one side and the other; and that Cardinal *Ginetti* had told him, that either nothing would be done; or if any thing, that which would do neither good nor hurt. And therefore, instead of ending the controversies, the *Popes* definition only produced more, viz. whether the *Propositions* condemned were in *Jansenius* or no? whether the *Pope* might not err in matter of fact? the *Jansenists* affirming this, the *Jesuits* denying it; and charging each other, with no less than *Heresie* about it. For upon the *Jesuits* asserting Octob. 12. A. D. 1661. that the *Pope* hath the same infallibility that *Jesus Christ* hath, not only in *Questions of right* but in matters of fact, and that thence those of their Church are bound to believe with a divine faith, that the 5. condemned *Propositions* are in *Jansenius*: the *Jansenists* publish a charge of heresie against the *Jesuits*, and such a heresie as was never broached in the Church before: being not only a solitary error or simple heresie, but a whole source of errors; or rather an universal heresie, which

“which overthrows all *Religion*. Which they  
 “go about at large to prove, by shewing, that  
 “this builds mens faith. on the *word of man*,  
 “and not on the *word of God*; because it con-  
 “cerns a thing, neither revealed nor attested by  
 “*God*; as to know, whether *Propositions* are  
 “really an *Authors* of this last Age; and (as  
 “he goes on) to make the *Popes* word equal  
 “with the *word of God*, is not only *heresie*, but  
 “horrid *impiety*, and a *species of Idolatry*: for  
 “this is giving to man the honour due only to  
 “*God*: because such an entire submission of our  
 “mind and of all our intellectuals, comprehend-  
 “ed in the act of our faith, is that Adoration  
 “which we pay to the prime verity it self.  
 And I dare now leave any one to Judge, whe-  
 ther upon so late an experiment of the *Con-*  
*stitutions* of two *Popes Innocent 10.* and *Alexan-*  
*der 7.* in order to the ending so great a Contro-  
 versie as this was, it be not apparent; that the  
*Popes Authority* signifies no more to the ending  
 Controversies, than the parties who are concern-  
 ed are willing that it should *i. e.* as far as they  
 do consent to obey them, and no farther?

§. 14. But it may be said, that it is true, there  
 are differences among them about the *Popes* power  
 and infallibility, and therefore he may not be  
 so fit to end Controversies; but there is no dis-  
 pute among them, about *Pope* and *Council* to-  
 gether, therefore in that case they are all agreed,  
 that they ought to submit. These are fine  
 things to be said, and appear plausibly, to  
 those who do not search into them; but those  
 that do, will easily find this as ineffectual a

The insufficiency of  
 Councils,  
 to end  
 Contro-  
 versies.

remedy, as the other. For if we examine but the wayes used by several parties among them, to avoid the decisions of some *Councils* against their particular opinions, we may see, how little the decrees of *Councils* can bind those, who have no mind to be tyed up by them. Either they say, the decision depended on a *matter of fact*, which the *Council* was not sufficiently informed in, and they believe a *Council* may err in a matter of fact; or else it did not proceed *after the way of a Council*; or it was not general; or its *decrees* were not received by the *Catholick Church*; or though some were received, yet not all; or however, the infallibility of a *Council* is not absolute; but supposing, that it proceeds according to the constant *tradition* of the *Church*, this unavoidably leaves the matter as much under debate, as if the *Council* had never meddled with it.

But if they do in earnest believe, that the *Pope* and *Council* can put an end to all Controversies among them, when they please; I would fain know, why they have not done this hitherto? Is not *unity* desirable among them? if not, why do they boast of it? if it be, why have they not obtained it, since they can so easily do it? what made them so extremely cautious in the *Council of Trent*, of meddling with any thing that was in *Controversie among themselves*? or was it, that they were all so much of a mind, that they had nothing to do, but to condemn their enemies? which was so far from being true, that there were very few things,

things, which came into debate, that they were agreed in; and therefore they were put sometimes to strange shifts, to find out general and ambiguous terms, which might not displease the dissenters, and yet leave the disputes as great as ever. They could not agree, so much as about the Title of the *Council*, many of the *Bishops* were for adding to the Title of the *most holy Council*, [ *Representing the Church Universal* ] which was eagerly opposed by the *Italians*, and with much ado avoided by the *Legats*, being no small controversie about words, but of very great consequence, about the power and authority of *Pope* and *Council*, if they had been suffered to go on in it. But the *Pope* hearing of this dispute, at the beginning, sent word to the *Legats*, *not to* broach any new difficulties in matter of faith; nor to determine any of the things controverted among *Catholicks*, and to proceed slowly in the Reformation. Excellent instructions, for the advancement of *Peace* and *Holiness*! Whoever will for that end peruse that incomparable history of the *Council*, will find how high the *Controversies* among themselves were, between the *Bishops* and the *Regulars* about *priviledges*; between the *Dominicans* and *Franciscans*, in many weighty points; between the *Italian Bishops* and others, about *Residence*, and the extent of *Episcopal power*; between the *Divines*, in most of the matters of doctrine; as might easily be shewed at large, if I loved the pains of transcribing; but I had rather refer the Reader, to that excellent history it self. I only renew my demand, why must no controversies among *Catholicks* be ended in the *Council*?

History of  
the Coun-  
cil of Trent.  
l. 2. p. 138.

P 129.

could they be better decided any where else ? if so, then the *Council* is not the best means of *Unity*; if not, then it seems there is no necessity of ending controversies among them, but they have *Unity* enough without it. And in truth, it is *Interest*, and not *Unity*, they look after; all such as hold opinions contrary to their *Interest*, must be proceeded against and condemned; but for others, let them quarrel and dispute as long as they will, they let them alone, if they touch not the *Popes Authority*, nor any of the gainful opinions and practices, which are allowed among them. And supposing their *Interest* be kept up, which the *Inquisition* is designed for, the *Court of Rome* is as great a *Friend* to toleration as may be; only what others call *different persuasions*, they call *School points*; and what others call *divisions*, they call *disputes*; the case is the same with their *Church* and others, only they have softer names for the differences among themselves; and think none bad enough for those, who cast off the *Popes Authority*, and plead for a *Reformation*. Here then lyes the profound mysterie of their *Unity*, that they are all agreed against us, though not among themselves; and are not we so against them too ? May not we plead for the *Unity*, that they have, on the same grounds ? We are all agreed against *Poperie*, as much as they are against *Protestants*; only we have some *Scholastick Disputes* among us, about indifferent things, and the *Episcopal Authority*, as they have; we have some zealous *Dominicans*, and busie and factious men, such as the *Jesuits* among them are, but setting aside these disputes,

we are admirably well agreed, just as they are in the *Roman Church*.

§. 15. 2. They say, *they do not differ in matters of faith*. But this is as true, as the other; for are they agreed in *matters of faith*, who charge one another with *heresie*? as we have already seen that they do. But if they mean, that they do not differ in *matters of faith*, because those only are *matters of faith*, which they are agreed in; they were as good say, they are agreed in the things they do not differ about: for the parties which differ, do believe the things in difference to be *matters of faith*; and therefore, they think differ from one another in *matter of faith*. But they are not agreed, what it is which makes a thing to be a *matter of faith*, and therefore no one can pronounce, that their differences are not about *matters of faith*; for what one may think not to be *de fide*, others may believe that it is; we see the *Popes personal infalibility* is become a *Catholick doctrine*, among the *Jesuits*, and declared to be plain *heresie*, by their *Adversaries*. The deliverance of souls from *Purgatory* by the prayers of the living, is generally accounted a *matter of faith* in the *Roman Church*; but we know those in it who deny it, and say it was a *novel opinion*, introduced by *Gregory I.* against the consent of *Antiquity*. It is a *matter of faith*, say the *Dominicans* and *Jansenists*, to attribute to God alone the praise of converting grace; and that grace efficacious by it self, was the doctrine of *Fathers*, and *Councils*, and the *Catholick Church*; and is it not then a *matter of faith*,  
in

Their differences are in matters of faith.



in their opinion, wherein the *Jesuits* and they differ from each other. To which purpose it was well said, by the Author of a Book printed at *Paris*, A. D. 1651. containing *Essays and Reflections on the state of Religion*; "that be-  
 "cause of the Controversies between the *Jansenists* and the *Jesuits*, it might with more  
 "reason be affirmed now, than in the time of  
 "Arrianism it self, that the whole Church seems  
 "to become heretical. For admitting, saith  
 "he, what is most certain, that the Church  
 "hath decreed *Calvinism*, *Pelagianism* and *Semi-pelagianism* to be heresies; and that the  
 "Doctors are those who sit in the Chair to be  
 "consulted withal upon points of Religion,  
 "all *Catholicks* are reduced to a most strange  
 "perplexity. For if a man shall address him-  
 "self, to those of the *Jansenian* party; they  
 "will tell him, that those who are termed *Molinists* are *Pelagians*, or at least *Semi-pelagians*;  
 "and on the other side, the *Molinists* will bear  
 "him down, that their Adversaries are *Calvinists*  
 "or else *Novatians*. Now all the *Doctors* of the  
 "*Catholick Church* ( a very few excepted ) are  
 "either of the one, or the other party. I  
 "leave you then to consider, to what prodigi-  
 "ous streights mens minds are reduced, since  
 "this is held as a general *Maxime*, that whoso-  
 "ever fails in one point of faith, fails in all. It  
 "is a matter of faith, say the *Dominicans*, that all  
 "persons, Christ only excepted, were born in sin, and  
 "therefore the contenders for the *Immaculate*  
 "*conception* must, in their judgement, differ in a  
 "point of faith from them. But if this distinction  
 should

should be allowed, to preserve the unity of  
 their Church ; why shall it not as well cure the  
*divisions* of ours. The most considerable, in  
 all respects, of the *dissenters* from the Church  
 of England, declare that they agree with us,  
 in all the *Articles of doctrine* required by our  
 Church ; will this be enough in their opinion,  
 to make us at *unity* with each other ? if not,  
 let them not plead the same thing for them-  
 selves, which they will not allow to us. I cannot  
 understand that the controversies about *ceremo-*  
*nies* (considered in themselves) among us, are of  
 any greater weight, than the disputes among  
 the *Fryers*, concerning their *habits* have been ;  
 and yet this controversie, only about the size of  
 their *hoods*, lasted in one *Order*, almost an *Age*  
 together ; and was managed with as great a  
 heat and animosity, as ever these have been  
 among us, and was with very much ado laid  
 asleep for a time, by the endeavours of four  
*Popes* successively. But if this signifies nothing  
 to *unity*, to say, *that the matters are not great*  
*about which the Controversies are, if the distur-*  
*bances be great which are caused by them ; that will*  
*reflect more sharply on their Church, than on*  
*ours, which hath so many differences which*  
*they account not to be about any matters of faith.*  
 But if these differences in point of doctrine  
 among them prove to be none in *matters of faith*,  
 it would be no difficult task, upon the same  
 grounds, to shew that they have no reason to  
 quarrel with us, for breaking the *unity* of their  
 Church ; because then we may differ from them  
 as little in *matters of faith*, as they do from  
 one

one another. This I need not take upon me to shew at large, because I find it already done to my hand by *F. Davenport, al. Sancta Clara* in his Paraphrastical Exposition of the 39 Articles of our Church : "about half of them, " he acknowledges to be *Catholicks* as they are, " without any further explication. The first " he meets with difficulty in, is that *about the* " *number of Canonical Books*, point blank against " the Council of Trent, but he acknowledges " that *Cajetan*, and *Franciscus Mirandula*, fully " agree with our Church in it, who quote " *Hierom*, *Ruffinus*, *Antoninus*, and *Lyra* of " the same opinion, as they might have done " many others ; but because our Church doth " not cast them wholly out of the Canon, he " dares not say it is guilty of *heresie* simply ; " and the rather, because *Waldensis* and *Driedo* " do hold, that it is only in the power of the " whole Church successively from the *Apostles*, " to declare what Books are *Canonical*, and what " not. For the 11 Article about *Justification*, he " saith the Controversie is only about words, " because we are agreed, that *God* alone is the " efficient cause of *Justification*, and that *Christ* " and his *Passion* are the meritorious cause of " it ; and the only question is about the for- " mal cause, which our Church doth not attri- " bute to the act of faith, as he proves by the " Book of *Homilies*, but only makes it a con- " dition of our being justified ; and they be- " lieve, that by faith we obtain our righteous- " ness by *Christ* ; so that he can find no difference " between them and us, in that point. He saith,

" the

"the Controversie about *merit* may be soon  
 "ended, according to the doctrine of our  
 "Church ; for they deny as well as we Artic. 13.  
 "that any works done before the Grace of Christ,  
 "and Inspiration of his Spirit, can merit any  
 "thing, and when we say, Article 12. that  
 "good works which follow justification, are plea-  
 "sing and acceptable to God in Christ ; if by  
 "that we mean, that they are accepted by  
 "Christ in order to a reward, by vertue of the  
 "promise of God through Christ, that is all  
 "the sense of merit, which he or the School of  
 "*Scotus* contends for. For works of Supereroga-  
 "tion, Article 14. he saith our Church con-  
 "demns them upon that ground, that men are  
 "said to do more by them than of duty they are  
 "bounden to do, which being generally under-  
 "stood they condemn, he saith, as well as we ;  
 "because we can do no good works, which  
 "upon the account of our natural obligation  
 "we are not bound to perform, though by par-  
 "ticular Precept we are not bound to them. In  
 "the 19 Article where our Church saith, that  
 "the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in  
 "their living and manner of ceremonies, but also  
 "in matters of faith ; he distinguisheth the par-  
 "ticular Church of Rome, from the Catholick  
 "Church, which is frequently understood by  
 "that name ; and he saith, it is only a matter  
 "of faith to believe, that the Catholick Church  
 "hath not erred, and not that the particular  
 "Church of Rome hath not. In the 20 Article  
 "our Church declares, that the Church ought  
 "neither to decree any thing against holy Writ,  
 "so

"so besides the same it ought not to enforce any  
 "thing to be believed, of necessity to salvation;  
 "this he interprets of what is neither actually  
 "nor potentially in the Scriptures, neither in  
 "terms nor by consequence; and so he thinks  
 "it Orthodox, and not against traditions.  
 "Article 21. wherein our Church determines  
 "expressly, against the infallibility of general  
 "Councils; he understands it, only of things  
 "that are not necessary to faith, or manners;  
 "which, he saith, is the common opinion  
 "among them. The hardest Article one would  
 think to bring us off in, was the 22. viz.  
*That the Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory,*  
*Pardons, worshipping and adoration, as well of*  
*Images, as of Reliques, and also Invocation of*  
*Saints is a fond thing, vainly invented, and ground-*  
*ed upon no warranty of Scripture.* But we need  
 not despair, as long as one bred up in the  
 Schools of Scotus designs our rescue; "he con-  
 fesses it to be a difficult adventure, but  
 "what will not subtilty and kindness do to-  
 "gether? He observes very cunningly, that  
 "these doctrines are not condemned absolute-  
 "ly and in themselves, but only the Romish  
 "doctrine about them; and therein, we are  
 "not to consider what the Church of Rome  
 "doth teach, but what we apprehend they  
 "teach, or what we judge of their doctrine,  
 "i. e. that they invoke Saints, as they do God  
 "himself; that Purgatory destroys the Cross of  
 "Christ, and warms the Popes Kitchen; that  
 "Pardons are the Popes Bills of Exchange;  
 "whereby he discharges the debts of what sin-  
 "ners

ners he pleases; that they give proper *divine*  
 "worship to Images and Reliques; all which,  
 "he saith, are impious doctrines, and we do  
 "well to condemn them. So that it is not  
 "want of faith, but want of wit, this good  
 "man condemns us for, which if we attain to  
 any competent measure of, whereby to under-  
 stand their doctrine, there is nothing but ab-  
 solute peace and harmony between us. This  
 grand difficulty being thus happily removed,  
 all the rest is done with a wet finger: for what  
 though our Church, Art. 24. saith, that it is a  
 thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and  
 the custome of the primitive Church to have pub-  
 lick prayer in the Church, or to Minister the Sa-  
 craments, in a tongue not understood of the people.  
 "Yet what can hinder a Scotist, from under-  
 standing by the Scripture, not the doctrine  
 "or command of it, but the delivery of it,  
 "viz. that the Scripture was written in a  
 "known tongue? nay, he proves, that our  
 "Church is for praying in Latin by this Ar-  
 "ticle, because that either is a known tongue,  
 "or ought to be so, it being publickly taught  
 "every where: and if it be not understood, he  
 "saith, it is not *per se*; but *per accident* that  
 "it is so; I suppose he means, the Latin tongue  
 is not to blame that the people do not under-  
 stand it; but they, that they learned their les-  
 sons no better at School. But what it is to be  
 said for Women, who do not think themselves  
 bound to go to School to learn Latin? "He an-  
 "swers very plainly, that S. Paul never meant  
 "them, for he speaks of those who were to  
 "say



" say *Amen* at the Prayers ; but both *S. Paul*  
 " and the *Canon Law*, he tells us, forbid Wo-  
 " men to speak in the Church. The case is  
 then clear, *S. Paul* never regarded what lan-  
 guage the *Women* used ; and it was no great  
 matter, whether they understood their *Prayers*  
 or not. But what is to be said to the *Coun-*  
*cil of Trent*, which pronounces an *Anathema*  
 to those who say, that *Prayers* are to be said  
 only in a known Tongue ? " This doth not  
 " touch our *Church* at all, he thinks ; because, in  
 " some *Colledges*, the Prayers are said in *Latin* :  
 " but although that be a known tongue there,  
 " it is no matter, as long as the Council of  
 " *Trent* hath put in the word *only* ; that clears  
 " our Church sufficiently. Besides the *Coun-*  
 " *cil of Trent* speaks expressly of the *Mass*,  
 " which our Article doth not mention, but  
 " only *Publick Prayers* : And the *Council* of  
 " *Trent* speaks of those, who condemn it as  
 " contrary to the *Institution of Christ* ; but  
 " our *Church* only condemns it, as contrary to  
 " the *Institution of the Apostles* ; but all the  
 " commands of the Apostles are not the com-  
 mands of Christ, therefore our Church de-  
 " clares nothing against *faith* in this Article.  
 Are not we infinitely obliged to a man that  
 uses so much subtilty, to defend our *Church*  
 from *error in faith* ? But that which is most  
 considerable is, what he cites from *Canus*,  
 " that it is no Heresie, to condemn a custom or  
 " Law of the Church, if it be not of something  
 " necessary to salvation ; especially if it be  
 " a custom introduced since the Apostles times,  
 " as

“as most certainly this was. For the five Sa-  
 craments rejected by our Church, Art. 25. he  
 saith, “they are not absolutely rejected as Sa-  
 craments, but as Sacraments of the same  
 Nature with Baptism and the Lords Supper,  
 which they yield to. For Transubstantiati-  
 on, which is utterly denied by our Church,  
 Art. 28. “he very subtilly interprets it, of a  
 carnal presence of Christs Body, which he  
 grants to be repugnant to Scripture, and to  
 destroy the nature of a Sacrament; but they  
 do believe Christs Body to be present, after  
 the manner of a Spirit, and so, our Church  
 doth not condemn theirs. As to communion  
 in both kinds, asserted by our Church, Art. 30.  
 he saith, “it is not condemned by the Coun-  
 cil of Trent therein, which only Anathema-  
 tizes those, who make it necessary to Salva-  
 tion, which our Church mentions not: and  
 however we condemn communion in one  
 kind, *Canus* proves him not to be guilty of  
 Heresie, who should say that the Church hath  
 erred therein. The 31 Article condemns the  
 Sacrifice of the Masse, i. e. saith he, “independ-  
 ently on the Sacrifice of the Cross, which is  
 propitiatory of it self, and the other only by  
 vertue of it. The 32. of the lawfulness of  
 Priests Marriage, “he understands of the Law  
 of God; in respect of which, it is the most  
 common opinion among them, he saith,  
 that it is lawful. The 34. about Traditions,  
 he interprets of those, which are not Do-  
 ctinal. The Book of Homilies approved  
 Art. 35. he understands as they do Books

"approved by their Church, not of every sen-  
 "tence contained therein, but the substance  
 "of the Doctrine; and he grants, there are  
 "many good things contained therein. For  
 "the 36. of consecration of Bishops and Mini-  
 "sters, he proves from *Vasquez*, *Conink*, *Ar-  
 "cudius*, and *Innocent 4.* that our Church hath  
 "all the essentials of *Ordination*, required in  
 "Scripture: and if the difference of form of  
 "words did null our Ordinations, it would  
 "do those of the Greek Church too. The  
 last Article he examin's is, *Art. 37. Of the Ci-  
 vil Magistrates power, in opposition to the Popes  
 Authority*; and he grants, "that the King may  
 "be allowed a *Supremacy*, i. e. such as may  
 "not be taken away by any one, as his *Superi-  
 "our*: and that by custom, a sufficient right  
 "accrues to him, over all *Ecclesiastical causes*:  
 "and that by divine and natural right, he  
 "hath jurisdiction over all *Ecclesiastical per-  
 "sons*, so far as the publick good is concerned.  
 "And withall he grants, that we yield no spiri-  
 "tual jurisdiction to the King, and no more  
 "than is contended for by the *French*, and the  
 "*Parliament of Paris*. That part which de-  
 nies the *Popes jurisdiction* in England, he saith,  
 "may be understood of the *Popes* challenging  
 "England, to be a *Fee* of the *Roman See*; but  
 "if it be otherwise understood, he makes use  
 "of many *Scholastick distinctions* of *actus fig-  
 "natus & exercitus*, &c. the sense of which  
 "is, that it is in some cases lawful, for a tem-  
 "poral Prince to withdraw his obedience from  
 "the *Pope*; but leaves it to be discussed, whe-  
 "ther

“ther he had sufficient reason for doing it. But there can be no *Hereſie* in matter of *fact*: it remains then, according to the ſenſe put upon our *Articles* by him with the help of his *Scholaſtick ſubtilties*, we differ no more from them in *points of faith*, than they do from one another. For ſuch kind of *diſtinctions* and *ſenſes* are they forced to uſe, and put upon each others opinions, to excuſe them from diſagreeing in *articles of faith*; and there is no reaſon that we ſhould not enjoy the benefit of them, as well as they: ſo that either they muſt be guilty of differing in *matters of faith*, or we are not.

§. 16. 3. They plead, that *their differences are only confined to their Schools, and do not diſturb the peace of the Church*. But there is as little truth in this, as there is *Unity* in their *Church*: as plainly appears, by what hath been ſaid already. Was the Controverſie, about the *Popes* temporal power, confined to the *Schools*? did not that make, for ſeveral *Ages*, as great diſturbances in the *Church*, as were ever known in it; upon any quarrel of *Religion*? Were the Controverſies, between the *Biſhops* and the *Monks*, confined to their *Schools*, about the extent of the *Episcopal* jurifdiction in former times, or in the renewing of this *Hierarchicall War* (as one of the *Fanſe- niſts* calls it) in *France*? But theſe things are large diſcovered already; I ſhall only add one thing more, which ſeems more like a diſpute of the *Schools* between the ſeveral *Orders* among them, about the *immaculate*

Their differences not confined to their Schools.

Scot. in 3.  
lib. sent. dist.  
3. q. 1. n. 10.  
Apolog. pro  
vita &  
morte. Joh.  
Duns Scoti.

conception; and it will easily appear, that Where-  
ever that dispute began, it did not rest in the  
*Schools*; if we consider the *tumults* and *disur-*  
*bances* which have been made, only on the  
account of it. This Controversie began in  
the *Schools*, about the beginning of the 14 Cen-  
tury; when *Scotus* set up for a new *Señt*, in op-  
position to *Thomas Aquinas*, and among other  
points of Controversie, he made choice of this  
to distinguish his followers by; but proposed  
it himself very timorously, as appears by his  
resolution of it, in his Book on the *Sentences*;  
however, his followers boast, that in this blef-  
sed quarrel he was sent for from *Oxford* to *Pa-*  
*ris*, from *Paris* to *Cologne*, to overthrow all  
Adversaries, and that he did great feats eve-  
ry where. But however this were, there were  
some not long after him, who boldly asserted  
what he doubtfully proposed, of whom *Franciscus*  
*Mayronis* is accounted the first; after  
him *Petrus Aureolus*, *Occam* and the whole or-  
der of *Franciscans*. But the great strength of  
this opinion lay not, in the wit and subtilty  
of the defenders of it, nor in any arguments  
from *Scripture* or *Antiquity*, but in that which  
they called the *Piety* of it, i. e. that it tended  
to advance the honour of the *B. Virgin*. For  
after the worship of her came to be so pub-  
lick and solemn in their *Church*, I do not in  
the least wonder, that they were willing to  
believe her to be *without sin*. I much rather  
admire they do not believe all their *Canonized*  
*Saints*, to have been so too; I am sure, the  
same reasons will hold for them all. But this

Opinion

Opinion by degrees obtaining among the people, it grew scandalous for any man to oppose it. So *Walsingham* saith, towards the latter end of this Century, the Dominicans Preaching the contrary opinion against the command, first of the Bishops in France, and then of the King and Nobles; they were out-lawed by the King, and absolutely forbid to go out of their own Convents, for fear of seducing the people: and not only so, but to receive any one more into their Order, that so the whole Order might in a little time be extinguished. The occasion of this persecution arose from a disturbance, which happened in *Paris*, upon this Controversie; one *Joh. de Montesono* publicly read against the immaculate conception, at which so great offence was taken, that he was convented before the Faculty of *Sorbonne*; but he declared, that he had done nothing but by advice of the chief of his Order, and that he would defend what he had said to death. His propositions were condemned, by the Faculty and the Bishop of *Paris*; upon which he appeals to the Pope, and goes to *Avignon* to *Clem 7.* where the whole Order of Dominicans appears for him, and the University against him by their Deputies of whom *Petr. de Alliaco* was the chief. The assertions which he was condemned for relating to this matter, were these following, as they are written in a Manuscript of *Petr. de Alliaco*, from which they are published by the late Author of the History of the University of *Paris*.

*Walsingham*  
hist. circa  
A.D. 1389.

Sext. Secu-  
lum univer-  
sit. Paris.  
p. 618.

1. To assert any thing to be true which is



against Scripture, is most expressly contrary to faith. This is condemned, as *false, and injurious to the Saints and Doctors.*

2. That all persons, Christ only excepted, have not derived Original sin from *Adam*, is expressly against faith. This is condemned as *false, scandalous, presumptuous, and offensive to pious ears.* Which he affirms particularly of the *B. Virgin*, and is in the same terms condemned.

3. It is as much against Scripture, to exempt any *one* person from Original sin, besides *Christ*, as to exempt *ten*.

4. It is more against Scripture, that the *B. V.* was not conceived in Original sin, than to say, that she was both in Heaven and on Earth, from the first Instant of her Conception or Sanctification.

5. That no exception ought to be allowed in explication of Scripture, but what the Scripture it self makes. All which are condemned as the former.

Against these Censures he appeals to the *Pope*, because therein *the doctrine of St. Thomas, which is approved by the Church, is condemned*; and that it was only in the *Popes power*, to determine any thing in these points. Upon this, the *University* publishes an *Apologetical Epistle*; wherein they declare, that they will rather suffer any thing, than endure *Herésie* to spring up among them; and vindicate their own authority, in their Censures; and earnestly beg the assistance of all the *Bishops and Clergy* in their cause, and their care to suppress such dangerous do-

doctrines; this was dated *Febr. 14. A.D. 1387.* But being cited to *Avignon*, thither they send the *Deputies* of the *University*, where this cause was debated with great zeal and earnestness, about a years time; and at last, the *Universities* Censure was confirmed, and *Joh. de Montesono* fled privately into *Spain*. But the *Dominicans* did not for all this, give over Preaching the same doctrine; upon which a grievous persecution was raised against them, as appears, not only by the testimony of *Walsingham*, but of the continuer of *Martinus Folonus*; who saith, that insurrections were every where made against them, and many of them were imprisoned, and the people denyed them *Alms and Oblations*, and they were forbidden to Preach, or read Lectures, or hear Confessions, in so much that they were made, he saith, the scorn and contempt of the people: and this storm lasted many years; and there was none to help them: becaule their enemies believed in persecuting them, they did honour to the *B. Virgin*. Nay the *Kings* Confessour, the *Bishop* of *Eucreux*, was forced to recant, for holding with the *Dominicans*; and to declare, that their opinions were false, and against faith; and they made him upon his knees beg of the *King*, that he would write to the *King* of *Arragon* and the *Pope*, that they would cause *Joh. de Montesono* to be sent prisoner to *Paris*, there to receive condign punishment. The next year, *A. D. 1389.* they made *Adam de Soissons*, Prior of a *Dominican Convent*, publicly recant the same Doctrine before the *University*; and *Stephen Gontier* was

*V. Meyer.*  
*Annal.*  
*Fland. l. 14.*  
*A. 1388.*

*Cavell's Ro-  
sar. B. Ma-  
rie test. 14.  
secul.  
wadding.  
Legatio de  
Concept.  
Sect. 3.  
tract. 12.  
S. 1.*

sent Prisoner to *Paris* by the Bishop of *Auxerre*, as suspected of *Heresie*, because he joyned with his Brethren in the appeal to the Pope: and another, called *Johannes Ade*, was forced to recant four times, for saying that he favoured the opinions of *Job. de Montesono*. But these troubles were not confined only to *France*, for not long after, *A. D. 1394.* *John King of Arragon* published a Proclamation, that no one under pain of Banishment should Preach or Dispute against the *immaculate Conception*: and in *Valencia*, one *Moses Mnerus* was banished by *Ferdinand* on that account, because the tumults could not be appeased without it. *Lucas Waddingus*, in his *History of the Embassy about the immaculate Conception*, gives a short account of the *Scandals* that have happened, by the tumults which have risen in *Spain*, and elsewhere, on this Controversie; which he dares not relate at large, he saith, because of the greatness of them: such as happened in the Kingdom of *Valencia*, *A. D. 1344.* in the Kingdom of *Arragon*, *A. D. 1398.* in *Barcelona*, *A. D. 1408.* and *1435.* and *1437.* In *Catalonia*, *A. D. 1451.* and *1461.* In all which, drawn from the publick Records, he saith, the Princes were forced to use their utmost power, to repress them for the present, and prevent them for the future: So in the Kingdom of *Murcia*, *A. D. 1507.* in *Batica* or *Andaluzia*, *A. D. 1503.* in *Castile*, *A. D. 1480.* The like scandals he mentions in *Germany*, and *Italy*, on the same account; and withal he saith, that these continued, notwithstanding all the endeavours of Popes, Princes, Bishops and Universities; but the

the tumults, he saith, that happened of later years in Spain, were incredibly turbulent and scandalous; and drawn from the authentick Registers which were sent by the several Cities to the King, and by the King to the Pope; which were so great, that those alone were enough to move the Pope, to make a Definition in this Controversie. Especially considering, that the same scandals had continued for 300. years among them, and did continue still, notwithstanding Paul 5. Constitution. Which is no wonder at all, considering what the Bishop of Malaga reports, that the Jesuites perswade the people to defend the immaculate conception with sword and fire, and with their blood. I now only desire to know, whether these be meer disputes of the Schools among them or no; and whether they have not produced as great disorder and tumults among the people, as controversies about points of faith are wont to do? So that upon the whole matter, (whether we respect the peace of the world, or factious disputes in Religion. I see no advantage at all the Church of Rome hath above others; and therefore reading the Scripture can be no cause of divisions among us; since there have been so many and great among those, who have most prudentially dispensed it, or rather, forbidden it to be read. Which was the thing I intended to prove.

Moral practice of the Jesuits.  
pag. 383.

## CHAP. VI.

*An Answer to the Remainder of  
the Reply.*

*The mis-interpreting Scripture doth not hinder its being a rule of faith. Of the superstitious observations of the Roman Church. Of Indulgences; the practice of them, in what time begun; on what occasion, and in what terms granted. Of the Indulgences in Jubilees, in the Churches at Rome, and upon saying some Prayers. Instances of them produced. What opinion hath been had of Indulgences, in the Church of Rome: some confess they have no foundation in Scripture, or Antiquity; others that they are pious frauds: the miserable shifts the defenders of indulgences were put to: plain evidences of their fraud from the Disputes of the Schools about them. The treasure of the Church invented by Aquinas, and on what occasion. The wickedness of men increased by Indulgences, acknowledged by their own Writers: and therefore condemned, by many of that Church. Of Bellarmins prudent Christians opinion of them. Indulgences no meer relaxations of Canonical Penance. The great absurdity of the doctrine of the Churches Treasure, on which Indulgences are founded, at large manifested. The tendency of them to destroy devotion, proved by experience; and the nature of the Doctrine.*

Of

Of Communion in one kind? no devotion in opposing an Institution of Christ. Of the Popes power of dispensing contrary to the Law of God, in Oaths and Marriages. The ill consequence of asserting Marriage in a Priest to be worse than Fornication, as it is in the Church of Rome. Of the uncertainty of faith therein. How far revelation to be believed against sense. The arguments to prove the uncertainty of the faith defended. The case of a revolter and a bred Papist compared, as to salvation: and the greater danger of one than the other proved. The motives of the Roman Church considered; those laid down by Bishop Taylor, fully answered by himself. An account of the faith of Protestants, laid down in the way of Principles: wherein the grounds and nature of our certainty of faith are cleared. And from the whole concluded, that there can be no reasonable cause to forsake the communion of the Church of England, and to embrace that of the Church of Rome.

§. I. **H**AVING thus far Vindicated the Scriptures, from being the cause (by being read among us) of all the Sects and Fanaticisms, which have been in England; now I return to the consideration, of the Remainder of his Reply. And one thing still remains to be cleared, concerning the Scripture; which is, *whether it can be a most certain rule of faith and life, since among Protestants it is left to the private interpretation of every fanciful spirit: which is as much as to ask, whether any thing can be a rule, which*

The misinterpret-  
ing Scrip-  
ture doth  
not hinder  
its being  
a rule of  
faith.

may



S. August.  
tract. 18. in  
Job. cap. 5.

may be mis-understood by those who are to be guided by it? or, whether it be fit the people should know the *Laws*, they are to be governed by; because it is a dangerous thing to mis-interpret *Laws*, and none are so apt to do it as the common people? I dare say, *St. Augustin* never thought, that *Heresies arising from mis-understanding Scriptures*, were a sufficient argument against their being a *Rule of faith*, or being read by the people; as appears by his discoursing to them, in the place quoted by him. For then he must have said to them to this purpose, "Good people, ye perceive  
" from whence *Heresies* spring, therefore as  
" you would preserve your soundness in the  
" faith, abstain from reading the *Scriptures*,  
" or looking on them as your *rule*; mind the  
" Traditions of the *Church*, but trust not  
" your selves with the reading what *God*  
" himself caused to be writ: it cannot be de-  
" nyed, that the *Scriptures* have far greater  
" excellency in them, than any other writ-  
" ings in the world, but you ought to consider,  
" that the best and most useful things are the  
" most dangerous when abused. What is more  
" necessary to the life of man, than eating and  
" drinking; yet where lyes intemperance and  
" the danger of surfetting, but in the use  
" of these? What keeps men more in their  
" wits, than sleeping; yet when are men so  
" lyable to have their throats cut, as in the  
" use of that? What more pleasant to the  
" eyes, than to see the *Sun*; yet what is there  
" so like to put them out as to stare too long  
" upon

“ upon him? Therefore since the most neces-  
“ sary and useful things are most dangerous,  
“ when they are abused; my advice must be,  
“ that ye forbear eating sleeping, and seeing, for  
“ fear of being surfettted, murdered or losing  
“ your sight; which you know to be very bad  
“ things. I cannot deny, but that the Scri-  
“ ptures are called *the bread of life, the food of*  
“ *our souls, the light of our eyes, the guide of*  
“ *our wayes*; yet since there may be so much  
“ danger in the use of *food, of light, and of a*  
“ *Guide*, it is best for you to abstain from them.  
Would any man have argued like St. *Augu-*  
*stin*, that should talk at this rate? yet this must  
have been his way of arguing, if his meaning  
had been to have kept the people from read-  
ing the *Scriptures*, because Heresies arise from  
mis-understanding them. But all that he in-  
fers from thence, is what became a wise man  
to say, viz. *that they should be cautious, in af-*  
*firming what they did not understand; and that*  
*hanc tenentes regulam sanitatis, holding this still*  
*as our rule of soundness in the faith, with great*  
*humility; what we are able to understand, accord-*  
*ing to the faith we have received, we ought to*  
*rejoice in it as our food, what we cannot, we ought*  
*not presently to doubt of, but take time to under-*  
*stand it; and though we know it not at present,*  
*we ought not to question it to be good and true:*  
*and afterwards saith, that was his own case, as*  
*well as theirs. What! S. Augustine, a Guide and*  
*Father of the Church, put himself equal with the*  
*people in reading and understanding Scriptures!*  
In which we not only see his humility, but how  
far

far he was from thinking, that this argument would any more exclude the people from reading the *Scriptures*, than the great *Doctors* of the *Church*. For I pray, were they the common people, who first broached Heresies in the *Christian Church*? Were *Arius*, *Nestorius*, *Macedonius*, *Eutyches*, or the great abettors of their *Doctrines*, any of the *Vulgar*? If this argument then holds at all, it must hold especially against them of parts and learning, that have any place in the *Church*; for they are much more in danger of spreading *Heresies*, by misinterpreting *Scriptures*, than any others are. But among Protestants, he saith, *Scripture is left to the Fanciful interpretation of every private Spirit*. If he speaks of our *Church*, he knows the contrary; and that we profess to follow the unanimous consent of the primitive *Fathers* as much as they, and embrace the doctrine of the four *General Councils*. But if there have been some among us, who have followed their own *Fancies* in interpreting *Scripture*; we can no more help that, than they can do in theirs; and I dare undertake to make good, that there have never been more absurd, ridiculous, and Fanciful Interpretations of *Scripture*, than (not the common people, but) the *Heads* of their *Church* have made, and other persons in greatest reputation among them. Which though too large a task for this present design, may ere long be the subject of another.

For the authority of *Hen. 8.* in the testimony produced from him, when they yield to it in the point of *Supremacy*, we may do it in the

fix articles or other points of *Popery*, which he held to the last. But we think it an advantage to our cause, in the matter of *Supremacy*, that they who were *Papists* in other points, as well as this against *reading the Scriptures*, yet contended so earnestly against the *Popes* Authority, as *Henry 8.* and *Stephen Gardiner, Bonner*, and the rest did. Doth he imagine that *Henry 8.* is owned by us, to be *Head* of our *Church*, as the *Pope* is with them, so as to think him *infallible*? He would be *Head* of the *Popish Church* in *England*, in spite of the *Pope*; but he never pretended to be *Head* of the *Reformation*, any farther than the *Supremacy* went; and if they will not believe him, when he was influenced, as they think, by *Cranmer*, neither are we to be tyed to his opinion, when he was guided by *Stephen Gardiner*, or any other; who were not greater enemies to *Granmer*, than to the *Reformation*.

§. 2. The next thing, wherein I said the sincerity of devotion is much obstructed in their Church, was by the multitude of superstitious observations, never used in the primitive Church, as I said I was ready to defend; to this his answer is very short. 1. That I should have said to prove; but so weak was I, as to think the Affirmative was to be proved, and the Negative defended. 2. He denies any such to be used in their Church. I desire then to know his opinion, of baptizing bells with God-fathers and God-mothers, holding the rope in their hands; being buried in a Monks habit; Pilgrimages to images of Saints; sprinkling holy water, spittle

Of their  
superstitious  
observations.

spittle and salt in baptism; their rites of exorcism; *Agnus Dei's*; the Pageantry of the Passion-week; the carrying about of the Host; the numbering of Ave Maria's and Pater Nosters, to make Rosaries and Psalters of the B. Virgin; the burning tapers at noon day, particularly on *Candlemas-day* with great devotion; the incensing of images; with many others which might be mentioned: and if he can vindicate these from *superstition*, it will be no hard task to vindicate the *Heathens*, in the ceremonies of their devotion; and to prove, that there can be no such thing as *Superstition* in the world.

Of Indulgences.

§. 3. I now come to the gross abuse of the people, in *Pardons* and *Indulgences*; by which I said the sincerity of devotion was much obstructed among them: he tells me, as an eye-witness, that there is great devotion caused by them, in *Catholick Countreys*; there being no Indulgence ordinarily granted, but enjoyns him that will avail himself of it, to confess his sins, to receive the Sacraments, to pray, fast and give alms; all which duties are with great devotion, he saith, performed by *Catholick people*, which without the incitement of an Indulgence had possibly been left undone. I will not be so troublesome to enquire, what sincerity of devotion that was he was an eye-witness of, which was caused by Indulgences; nor what sort of persons they were, who were thus devout at receiving them. I think it will be sufficient for my purpose to prove, that no persons in the world, who understand what Indulgences mean;

mean, in the *Church of Rome*, can be excited to any devotion by them, but that on the contrary, they tend exceedingly to the obstructing of it: which I shall do by shewing, that either they are great and notorious cheats, if that be not meant by them which is expressed in them; or if it be, that nothing could be invented that tends more to obstructing their own way of devotion, than these do. 1. That they are great and notorious cheats, if that be not meant by them which is expressed in them. For which we are to understand first, what hath been expressed in their *Indulgences*. 2. What opinion those of their own *Church* have had concerning them.

§.4. 1. What hath been expressed in their *Indulgences*; the eldest *Indulgences* we meet with, are those which are made by the *Popes*, to such who undertook their quarrels against their enemies; and the first of this kind I can meet with is, that of *Anselm Bishop of Luca*, Legat of *Gregory 7.* which he gave to those of his party, who would fight against the Emperor *Henry 4.* which *Baronius* relates from his *Pœnitentiary*; in which was promised remission of all their sins, to such who would venture their lives in that *Holy War*. And *Gregorius 7.* himself in an epistle to the *Monks of Marseilles*, who stuck close to him, promised an *Indulgence of all their sins*. The like *Indulgence* with remission of all their sins, was granted to those who would fight against the *Saracens in Africa*, by *Victor*, who succeeded *Gregorius 7.* after him followed *Urban 2.* who granted an

The practice of Indulgences.

Baron. ad A. D. 1084 n. 15.

Greg. 7. l. 6. Ep. 15.

Lco Cast. hist. l. 3. c. 71.



Gul. Tyrius  
l. 1. hist.  
Orient.

Will. Malm.  
l. 4. c. 2.  
Order. Vi-  
talis hist.  
Eccles. ad  
A.D. 1095.

Bernard.  
Exhort. ad  
milit. templi  
c. 5.

Morinus de  
Sacram.  
Pœnit. l. 10.  
c. 21.

Indulgence to all who would go in the War to the Holy Land, of all their sins, and as Gul. Tyrius saith, expressly mentioned those, which the Scripture saith do exclude from the Kingdom of God, as murder, theft, &c. and not only absolved them from all the Penances they deserved by their sins; but bid them not doubt of an external reward after death, as Malmfbury saith; the like is attested by Ordericus Vitalis, in whose younger days this Expedition began: upon which, he saith, all the Thieves, Pyrats, and other Rogues, came in great numbers, and listd themselves, having made confession of their sins; and if we believe St. Bernard, there were very few but such among them; which he rejoyceth very much in: and saith, there was a double cause of joy in it, both that they left the Countries where they were before, and now went upon such an enterprize which would carry them to Heaven. This way of Indulgences, being thus introduced, was made use of afterwards, upon the like occasions by Callistus 2. A. D. 1122. by Eugenius 3. A. D. 1145. by Clem. 3. A. D. 1195. and others after them, who all promised the same Indulgences that Urban 2. had given. And it is well observed by Morinus, that these Indulgences cannot be understood of a meer relaxation of Canonical Penances; because such a remission of all sins is granted, upon which eternal life follows; and therefore must respect God; and not barely the Church: and because absolution was to be given upon them, which saith he, according to the discipline then in the Church, ought

not

not to be given, but till the Canonical Penance had been gone through, or at least the greatest part of it. But therein he is very much mistaken, when he saith, that the Popes never granted these plenary Indulgences, but only to encourage an Expedition to the Holy Land: For Gelasius 2. A. D. 1118. granted the same to the Christian souldiers, at the siege of Saragoza; as appears by the Bull it self, in Baronius. Honorius 2. in the quarrel he hath with Roger of Sicily, gave the same to all, who having confessed their sins should dye in the Warr against him; but, if they chanced to escape with their lives, but half their sins were pardoned. Alexander 3. gave to his Friends at Ancona, who should visit the 12. Churches and their own Cathedral all Lent Fasting, as full an Indulgence, as if they went to Hierusalem; and besides this, every first Sunday in the month as great an Indulgence, (i. e. I suppose, for as many days) as a man could take up sands in both hands. This Baronius thinks a little too much: and therefore rejects it as fabulous, because the same Pope, in an Indulgence given to the Church of Ferrara, grants but a year of criminals, and a seventh part of venials; but he doth not consider, that the case of Ancona was peculiar, because of the great friendship that City had shewn to the Pope in his distress; and this Indulgence was transcribed from a very ancient Manuscript, and better attested than many other things, which he never disputes. But if it be a cheat let it pass for one; and it is no great matter to me, whether it were a cheat of the Popes, or

Cap. 23:

Baron. ad  
A. D. 1118  
n. 31.Id ad. A. D.  
1127. n. 5.Id. ad. A. D.  
1177. n. 8.Id ad. A. D.  
1177. n. 76.

- Ad A. D. the Church of Ancono. But he doth not at all  
 1179. n. 7. question the *Indulgence* granted by the same  
 Pope, to those who would take up arms against  
 the *Albigenses*, which to those who dye in that  
 cause, is not only *pardon of all their sins*, but  
 an eternal reward: but for such as refused to  
 go, no less than excommunication is denounced  
 against them. And *Honorius 3.* in the same  
 cause, granted an *Indulgence* in the same terms,  
 as to those who went to the *Holy Land*: and  
 1119. n. 3.  
 1d. A. D. *Gregorius 9.* to all who should take his part  
 1139. n. 8. against the *Emperour Frederic 2.* which *Bzovius*  
 confesseth to be usual with the *Popes* to give, to  
 Ad. A. D. those who would fight against *Saracens*, hereticks  
 1208. n. 5. or any other enemies of theirs.

This practice of *Indulgence*, being once taken  
 up, was found too beneficial to be ever let fall  
 again; and private *Bishops* began to make great  
 use of it, not in such a manner as the *Popes*, but  
 they were unwilling not to have as great a share  
 as they could get in it, thence they began to  
 publish *Indulgences*, to those who would give  
 money towards the building or repairing *Churches*,  
 or other publick works; for this, they  
 promised them a pardon of the 7. or 4. or 3.  
 part of their *sins*, according as their bounty  
 deserved. This was first begun by *Gelasius 2.*  
 for the building of the Church of *Saragoza*  
 A. D. 1118. and was followed by other *Bi-*  
*shops*; in so much that *Morinus* is of opinion,  
 that *Mauricius Bishop of Paris* built the great  
 Church of *Nostredame* there, in that manner;  
 and he saith, he can find no ground for this  
 practice of *Indulgences*, before the 12. Century,  
 and

*Morinus' de*  
*Pœnitent.*  
 l. 10. c. 20.

and answers *Bellarmins* arguments, for a greater antiquity of them; and proves all his testimonies, from *Gregories Stations*, *Ludgerus* his *Epistle*, and *Scrgius* his *indulgence* in the *Church* of *S. Martin* at *Rome* produced by *Baronius*, to be meer *impostures*. But the *Bishops* of *Rome*, finding how beneficial these *Indulgences* were, soon resolved to keep the *keys* of this *Treasury* of the *Church*, in their own hands; & therefore quickly abridged other *Bishops* of this power; and made great complaint, that by the indiscreet use of *Indulgences* by the *Bishops*, the *keys* of the *Church* were contemned and discipline lost; so *Innocent 3.* in the *Council* of *Lateran*, can. 62.; and therefore decrees, that in the dedication of a *Church*, though where there were several *Bishops* together, they should not grant any *Indulgence* above a year, nor any single *Bishop* above 40. days. But we are not to imagine, that the *Popes* ever intended to tie their own hands, by these *Canons*; but they were too wise, to let others have the managing of so rich a stock, as that of the *Church* was; which would bring in so great a harvest, from the *sins* of the people. Thence *Boniface 8.* first instituted the year of *Jubilee* A. D. 1300; and in his *Bull* published for that end, grants not only a *plenary*, and larger, but most *plenary remission* of *sins* to them, that (if *Romans* for 30. it strangers for 15. days in that year (should visit the *Churches* of the *Apostles*.) This was brought afterwards by *Clem. 6.* to every 50. years; and since, to 25. or as often as his *Holiness* please: but in all of them, a most *plenary remission* of *sins* is granted. It were

*Baron ad*  
A. D. 847.

*Ext. aug.*  
*Commun.*  
l. 5 tit 9.  
c. 1. *Baron.*  
ad A. D.  
1300 n. 1

Bell de In-  
dul. l. 1 c. 9

worth the while to understand the difference between a *plenary larger*, and *most plenary Indulgence*: since Bellarmine tell us, *that a plenary Indulgence takes away all the punishment due to sin*. But these were the fittest terms to let the people know, they should have as much for their money as was to be had, and what could they desire more? And although Bellarmine abhorres the name of *selling Indulgences*, yet it comes all to one; the Popes give *Indulgences*, and they give money; or they do it not by way of *purchase*, but by way of *Alms*: But commend me to the plain honesty of Boniface 9. who being not satisfied with the oblations at Rome, sent abroad his *Jubilees* to *Colen, Magdeburg*, and other Cities; but always sent his *Collectors*, to take his share of the money that was gathered, and inserted in them that Clause, *porrigentibus manus Adjutrices*, which in plain English, is *to those who would give money for them*: without which no *Indulgence* was to be had, as Gobelinus *Persona* saith: Who likewise adds this remarkable passage, that the Preachers of the *Indulgences* told the people, to encourage them to deal for them, that they were not only à *pœnâ* but à *culpâ* too, i. e. not meerly from the temporal punishment of sin, but from the fault it self which deserved eternal; this made the people look into them, and not finding those terms but only a *most plenary remission*, they were unsatisfied, because they were told that the fault could be forgiven by *God* alone; but if they could but once find that the *Pope* would undertake to clear all scores with *God* from

Gobelius.  
Persona  
Cosmodr. at.  
6. c. 86.

for them, they did not doubt but they would be worth their money. Whereupon he saith *those very terms were put into them*: then the wiser men thought these were counterfeit, and made only by the Pardon mongers; but upon further enquiry they found it otherwise. How far this trade of *Indulgences* was improved afterwards, in the time of *Alexander 6.* and *Leo 10.* the *Reformation* which began upon occasion of them, will be a lasting monument; which was the greatest good the World ever received by them.

§. 5. But we are not to think, since *Indul-* Of Indul-  
gences are such great kindneses to the souls of gences at  
men, that they should be only reserved for years Rome.  
of *Jubilee*; for what a hard case may they be in, who should chance to die but the year before? Therefore the *Popes* (those tender Fathers of the Church) have granted very comfortable ones, to many particular places, and for the doing some good actions, that no one need be in any great perplexity for want of them. Other places it is probable a man may go to *Heaven* as soon from as *Rome*, but there is none like that for escaping *Purgatory*; if a man confess his sins, and but stumble into one of the seven *Churches*, it is a hard case if he doth not escape; at least for one thousand years. I need not reckon up what vast *Pardons* are to be had there at easie rates, since they have been so kind at *Rome*, to publish a *Catalogue* of them in several Books; an extract out of which, is very lately set forth in our own language. Those who have gone about to compute them, have found that

Hen. Fonlis  
Preface to  
the History  
of Ro-  
mish usur-  
pations.  
Bell. de In-  
dulg. l. 2. c.  
20.



Onuphrius  
de 7. urbis  
Ecclesiis.  
Casar Ras-  
poni. de Ba-  
silicâ La-  
teranensi.  
l. 2. c. 14.  
p. 204.

*Indulgences* for a *million* of years are to be had at *Rome* on no hard terms: *Bellarmino* would seem to deny these pardons for so many years, as far as he durst, as though they were not delivered by *Authentick* Writers; but I desire no more than what *Onuphrius* hath transcribed, from the *Archives* of the *Churches* themselves; and we may judge of the rest by what *Cesar Rasponi*, a *Canon* of the *Lateran Church* and a present *Cardinal*, hath written lately of that one *Church*, in a Book dedicated to *Alexand. 7.* He tells us therefore, *there is so vast a bank of the Treasure of the Church laid up there, that no one need go any further to get full pardon of all his sins; and that it is impossible for any one, to reckon up the number of the benefits to be had there by it.* In the *Feast of the Dedication* of that *Church*, at the first throw, if a man be well confessed before, he gets, if he be a *Roman*, a pardon of 1000 years, if a *Tuscan* 2000; but if he comes from beyond Sea 3000 years; this is well for the first time. The like *Lottery* is again at that *Church*, on *Cena Domini.* But *Boniface 9.* would never stand indenting with men for number of years, but declares, *if men will come either for devotion or pilgrimage, (no matter which) he shall be clear from all sin:* and what would a man have more? But besides this, there are other particular seasons of opening this *Treasury*; and then one may take out as much as they can wish for: As when the *Image* of our *Saviour* is shewn, all that come thither have their sins pardoned infallibly: and many other days in the year; which

which the Author punctually reckons up, and are so many that a *Canon* of that *Church* may dispose of some thousands of years, nay *plenary remissions*, and yet escape *Purgatory* at last himself. But besides what belongs to the *Church* it self, there is a little *Oratory* or *Chapel* belonging to it, called the *Holy of Holies*, where it is impossible for any man to reckon up the number of *Indulgences* granted to it. These vast numbers of years then are no fiction of *Pardon-mongers*, as *Bellarmin* is sometimes ready to say; unless he will have the *Popes* called by that name, or charge the *Holy Churches* at *Rome* with so gross impostures.

§. 6. But suppose it should be a mans fortune never to see *Rome* (as it hath many a good mans) must he be content to lie and rot in *Purgatory*, or trust only to the kindness of his Friends? no, we that live at this distance, have some comfort left: there are some good *prayers*, appointed for us to use, which will help us at a need; or else, the Book of the *hours* of the *B. Virgin* *secundum usum Sacrum*, is strangely mistaken; but herein I am likewise prevented by the Author of the *Preface* lately mentioned; but my edition being elder than either of those mentioned by him seems to have something peculiar to it, or at least omitted by him.

As when it saith of the Prayer *Obsecro te Domina Sancta Maria, &c.* Who all them that be in the state of *Grace*, that daily say devoutly this prayer before our blessed Lady of pity she wolle shewe them her blessed visage, and warn them the day and hour of death;

*Raspon. de  
Basil. Later.  
l. 4. c. 19.*

Of Indul-  
gences for  
saying  
some  
prayers.

*Horæ B. V.  
Maria se-  
cundum  
usum Sa-  
crum, p. 38.*

deth, and in there last end, the Angells of God shall yeld there soles to Heaben, and he shall obtayn 5 hundzeth yerres, and too many Lenttis of pardon, graunted by 5 holy Fathers Popes of Rome. That is pretty well for one prayer!

But this is nothing to what follows, to a much shorter prayer than that.

Page 42.

Our Holy Father Sixtus 4. Pope hath graunted, to all them that devoutly say this prayer befoze the Image of our Lady in the sone eleben thousand yeres of pardon. A prayer said to good purpose! I confesse I can hardly stoop now, to those that have only days of pardon promised them; yet for the sake of the procurer, I will mention one.

Page 43.

Our Holy Father Pope Sixtus hath graunted at the Instance of the highmost and excellent Princeesse Elizabeth late Queen of Englonde and wyfe to our Soberaign liege Lord King Henry the 7th. God have mercy on her swet soull, and all Cristen soulls that ebery day in the mozning after 3 tollinges of the Abe bell say 3 times the hole salutation of our Lady Ave Maria gratia, that is to say, at 6 the klock in the mozning 3 Abe Maria, att 12 of the klock at none 4 Abe Maria, and att 6 a klock at eben, for ebery time so doing, is graunted of the spritual treasour of holy Church 3 hundzeth dayes of parden tottens quotiens. To which is annexed, the pardon of the two Arch-bishops and nine Bishops, forty dayes a peice, three times a day, which began, A. D. 1429. the seventh year

year of Henry 7. And the summ of the Indulgence and pardon for every *Ave Maria*, is 800. days *totiens quotiens*.

But if a man thinks himself well provided already, and hath a mind to help his Friends, there is nothing like the 15. O. s of St. *Brigitt*.

*Thps* be the 15 O. O s. the which the holy *P. 50.* *Virgin S. Bzpgitta* was woente to say duple, befoze the holy rode in *S. Pauls Church* at *Rome*; who soe says this a pere, he schall deliber 15 soules out of *Purgatoz* of his next kyndzen, and conbert other 15 sinners to gode lpf and other 15 righteous men of his kynd shall persevere in gode lpf. And wat ye desyre of God ye schall habe it, if yt be to the salbarion of your soule.

Not long after, we find a better endowment with number of years, than any we have yet met with.

To all them that befoze this Image of py- *P. 54.* tie deboutly say 5 *Pater Noster* and 5 *Aves* and a *Credo*, pitpoussy beholding these Armes of *Cressys* passion, are graunted thirty two thousand seven bundzed and fity years of pardon; and *Sixtus* the 4. Pope of *Rome* hath made the 4 and the 5 pizer, and hath doubled his foresaid pardon.

The Prayer with *Boniface* 6. his *Indulgence* of *P. 58.* ten thousand years pardon, will hardly down with me now: much less that niggardly grant of *John* 22. of a *hundred days* pardon. What customers doth he hope to find at such sordid rates?

*Sixtus* 4. for my money; witness this *Indulgence*.

Our

P. 61.

Our holy Father Sixtus 4. graunted to all them that beyn in state of Grace, sayeing this prayer following, immediately after the elebation of the body of our Lord cleene remission of all their sins perpetually enduring. And also John the 3 Pope of Rome, at the request of the Queen of England, hath graunted unto all them that deboutly say this prayer befoze the Image of our Lord Crucified, as many days of pardon as there were woundes in the body of our Lord in the tyme of his bitter passion, the which were 5365.

It is well *Sixtus* came after him, or else his market had been spoiled, the other so much out-bid him.

Next to cleane pardon, *John* 22. offers fair; only the task is somewhat harder, it being for three Prayers.

P. 66.

*Thys* 3 prayers be wyrtton in the Chappelle of the holy crosse in Rome, otherwise called *Sacellum sanctæ Crucis 7 Romanorum*, whow that deboutly say them shall obtayn 90000 years of pardon for dedly sins graunted by our holie Father *Job. 22. Pope of Rome*.

Methinks he should have made them up a full hundred thousand, when his hand was in; but I perceiue they are *prudential*, in dispensing Pardons as well as *Scripture*.

But there is one condition implied in some of these prayers, called *being in a state of Grace*, the want of which may hinder the effect of them; but although due confession with absolution will at any time put a man into it, yet is there

there no remedy without it? we will try once more for that, and end these *Indulgences*. And I think the prayer of S. Bernardine of Siena will relieve us.

**Thys** most devoutly prayer said the holy P. 72. Father S. Bernardine daylie kneeling in the worship of the most holy name Iesus. And yt is well to believe that through the invocation of that most excellent name of Iesu, S. Bernard. obtayned a singular reward of perpetual consolation of our Lord Iesu Christ. And thys prayer is written in a Table that hangeth at Rome in S. Peters Church nere to the high altar, there as our holy Father the Pope duely is wonte to say the office of the Masse. And how that devoutly with a contrite heart dayly say this Orison, if he be that day in the state of eternal damnation, than this eternal payne shall be chaunged him in tempoꝛal payne of Purgatoꝛy, than if he hath deserbed the payne of Purgatoꝛy, yt shall be forgotten and forgiven, throꝛow the infinite mercy of God.

This is enough of all reason.

And so much shall serve, to set forth what the practice of *Indulgences* hath been in the Church of Rome, and what is expressed in them.

§. 7. 2. I now come to give account, what opinion hath been had of these *Indulgences* in their own Church; wherein some have freely confessed, they have no Foundation in *Scripture* or *Antiquity*; others, that they are only *pious frauds*, and those who have gone about to defend them, have been driven to *miserable shifis* in the defence of them.

What opinion hath been had of *Indulgences* in the Roman Church.

1. Some



*Durand. in  
sentent. l. 4.  
dist. 20. q. 3.*

*Joh. Major  
in sent. l. 4.  
dist. 20.*

*Cajetan  
op. sc. de  
Indulgent.  
init.*

*Soto in sent.  
l. 4. dist. 20.*

*Greg. de  
Valent. de  
Indulg. c. 4.  
Eftius in  
sent. l. 4.*

*dist. 20. S. 2  
Morinus de  
penitent. l.  
10. c. 20.  
n. 9.*

*Roff. c. Lu-  
ther. art. 18.*

*Polyd. Vir-  
gil. de In-  
vent l. 8. c. 1*

*Alphonf. à  
Castro. ad-  
vers. hæref.  
l. 8. v. Indul.*

1. Some have confessed, that they have no foundation in Scripture, or Antiquity. Durandus saith, that very little can be affirmed, with any certainty, concerning Indulgences; because neither the Scripture speaks expressly of them, and the Fathers, Ambrose, Hillary, August. Hierom speak not at all of them: and therefore he hath no more to say, but that the common opinion is to be followed herein. The same is said, by another School-man; who adds this, that though it be a Negative argument, yet it is of force, because in the time of those Fathers they were very much skilled in the Scriptures; and it were very strange, if Indulgences were to be found there, that they did not find them. This is likewise affirmed by Cajetan, Dominicus Soto, and all those who assert that the use of Indulgences came into the Church, upon the relaxing the severity of the primitive discipline; which they say continued in use, for a 1000. years after Christ. But the most express testimonies in this case, are of Bishop Fisher, who saith that the use of Indulgences came very late into the Church; and of Polydore Virgil, following his words; and of Alphonfus à Castro, who ingeniously confesseth, that among all the controversies be writes of; there is none which the Scripture or Fathers speaks less of, than this; but however, he saith, though the use of them seem to have come very late into the Church, they ought not to be condemned; because many things are known to latter ages, which the ancient writers were wholly ignorant of, for which he instanceth in Transubstantiation, procession from the Son, and Purgatory.

But

But he ought to have remembered what himself had said before, in a chapter of finding out heresies; that, the novelty of any doctrine makes it of it self to be suspected, because Christ and his Apostles did give sufficient instruction for attaining eternal life; and after the Law given by Christ, no other Law is to be expected, because his Testament is eternal. Let this be applied to his own confession of these doctrines, and the consequence is easily discerned. And it is an excellent saying of Bellarmin, that, in things which depend on the will of God, nothing ought to be affirmed, unless God hath revealed it in the H. Scriptures. Therefore, according to the opinion of these persons, who assert the doctrine of Indulgences to have no Foundation in Scripture or Antiquity, it can be no other than a notorious Cheat.

2. Some in the Church of Rome, have called them pious frauds. This appears by the Controversies which arose upon Indulgences, at the same time when they began to grow common. For Aquinas and Bonaventure tell us, that there were some in the Church who said, that the intention of the Church in Indulgences was only by a pious fraud to draw men to charitable acts, which otherwise they would not have done; as a mother which promiseth her child an apple to run abroad, which she never gives him, when she hath brought him to it. Which is the very instance they used, as Gregory de Valentia confesseth. But this Aquinas rejects, as a very dangerous opinion; because this is in plain terms; to make the Church guilty of a notori-

Alphons. l. 1.  
c. 12.

Bellar. de  
amiss. gratiæ  
l. 6. c. 3.  
resp. ad  
obj. 6.

Aquin. sup-  
plement. sum.  
q. 25. art. 2.  
Bonavent.  
in sent. l. 4.  
dist. 20. q. 6.

Greg. de  
Valent. de  
Indulg. c. 2.

ous Cheat; and as, he saith, from St. Augustine, if any falshood be found in Scripture, it takes away the authority of the whole; so if the Church be guilty of a cheat in one thing, she will be suspected in all the rest. This, saith Bonaventure, is to make the Church to lie and deceive, and Indulgences to be vain and childish toys. But for all these hard words, they had a great deal of reason on their side: for the Indulgences were expresse for the remission of the sins of those who did such and such things, as the giving a small sum of money towards the building of a Church or an Hospital; they therefore asked, whether the Indulgences were to be taken as they were given or no? if they were, then all those had full remission of sins, on very easie terms; if not, then what is this else but fraud and cheating; and can be only called pious, because the work was good which they did? This put the defenders of Indulgences very hard to it; *Præpositivus*, one of the eldest of the Schoolmen, confesseth that it looks a little oddly for a man to be absolved from all his sins for three pence, given in three several places; and that the rich by this means have a mighty advantage over the poor: but he resolves it all into the power of the Church. *Petrus Cantor* confesseth the difficulties great, but only for the Churches Authority; and especially in those general Indulgences which are pronounced without any distinctions. Therefore he, saith *Greg. 4.* as he calls him (*Morinus* thinks *Greg. 8.*) in the Dedication of the Church of Benevento, told the people, it was much safer for them to undergo their penance,

*Abud Morin. l. 10. c. 20. n. 5.*

*Ib. n. 7.*

penance, than to receive an Indulgence from him of any part of it: and another Bishop, being desired an Indulgence would give it but for two dayes; but if any one asks, whether the remission of sins were presently obtained after Indulgence, or only when they are incapable of penance, viz, after death; for his part, he saith, he desires them to consult the Pope or the Bishop that gives the Indulgence, whether of these opinions is true; and when the Bishop of Paris shewed him the magnificent Church he had built by vertue of Indulgences, Cantor told him, he had done much better if he had let them alone, and perswaded the people to undergo their penance.

But because the form of Indulgences ran in such large and general terms; it grew to be a great Question, among the Schoolmen, Whether the validity of Indulgences was as great, as the words of them? which in other terms is, whether the Church did cheat or not, in giving them? for if they were not to understand them, according to the plain words of them, what is this but a gross imposture to abuse the credulous people, and laugh in their sleeves at them for their simplicity. For while the people have so good an opinion of their Church, as to believe the truth of what she declares, and to take Indulgences according to the sense of the words; if their meaning who give them be otherwise than is expressed, it is one of the most abominable cheats that ever was invented by men. For picking purses, forging deeds, or betraying men are tolerable things in comparison; but to abuse and ruine their souls, under a pretence of par-

Guil. Al-  
tissiodor.  
sum. l. 4.  
tract. 6. c. 9.

Mo'in l. 10.  
c. 21. n. 3.

Greg. de  
Valent. de  
Indulg. c. 2.

Albert. M.  
in sent. l. 4.  
dist. 20.  
art. 17.

doing their sins, is the utmost degree of fraud and imposture. Let us now see how these *Hucksters* defend their *Church* in this case ; for the *Question* hath been debated among the *Schoolmen*, ever since *Indulgences* came up. Some resolve it thus ; that *Indulgences* do signifie as much as the *Church* declares, but with these conditions ; that there be sufficient authority in the giver, necessity in the receiver, that he believes the *Church* hath power to give them, that he be in a state of grace, and give a sufficient compensation ; which is to overthrow what they said, unless those conditions were expressed in the *Indulgences*. Some say, that common *Indulgences* held only for sins of Ignorance ; others, for venial sins ; others, for penances negligently performed ; others, for Purgatory pains. Some again said, that these could signifie no more than a relaxation of *Canonical penance*, whatever the words were, and that they were introduced for no other end, and they do not reach any farther, than the *Churches Canonical power* or judgement doth, and not to the judgement of God. But this opinion, saith *Greg. de Valentiâ* doth not differ from the *Hereticks* ; and *withall*, he saith, upon this principle, *Indulgences* do no more hurt than good ; for if it were not for them, the sinner by his penance might take away some part of his punishment ; but now he relies upon his *Indulgence*, and does no penance, and so undergoes his whole punishment. *Albertus M.* saith, they are much mistaken, who say that *Indulgences* are to be understood as large as their words are, without any farther condition ; and that this is to enlarge

enlarge the Court of Gods mercy too far and sayes many conditions are to be understood, which are not expressed in them. This gave the first occasion to the *Treasure* of the *Church*, invented by *Aquinas* to satisfie this argument of *Albertus*, concerning the mercy of *God* being extended too far by *Indulgences*; for hereby, what punishment is taken away from one is made up by the punishment of another, which is reckoned upon his account. And therefore, he saith, the cause of the remission of punishment is not the devotion, work, or gift of the receiver, but the *Treasure* of merits which was in the *Church*, which the *Pope* might dispense; and therefore the quantity of the remission was not to be proportioned to the acts of the receiver, but to the stock of the *Church*? This rich Bank of the Churches Stock being thus happily discovered, they do not question now, but to set all accounts even with it, and therefore *Aquinas* confidently affirms, that *Indulgences* are to be understood simply, as they are expressed; for *God*, saith he, doth not need our lye or deceit; which he grants must have been, if *Indulgences* had not been meant as they were expressed: and all men would sin mortally, who Preached *Indulgences*. Yet to obtain the *Indulgence*, he saith, that every man must give according to his ability; for the objection being put, concerning an *Indulgence* being given to three several places, that who-soever gives a penny towards the building of a Church in every one of these places, shall for each of them have the third part of his sins forgiven him, so that for three pence a man gets a



plenary remission; he answers, *that a poor man may indeed have it so, but it is to be understood that a rich man ought to give more.* For it is all the reason in the world, that a rich man should pay greater *Use* for the stock of the *Church*, than a poor man can do: and it is reasonably to be presumed, that he had more sins to be pardoned, than the other; and therefore, whatever the general terms are, there must be some reserve to hook in more from the rich, than was expressed in the first bargain. But if the rich man should plead *Law* in the case, and cry out it was *Covin* and *Fraud*, to demand more than the first *Contract* was; I am not skilful enough to determine, what *action* the *Church* can have against him. But there is another shrewd objection, mentioned by *Bonaventure*; which is, *that a man gets by sinning*, as suppose two men to receive the remission of a *third part* of their sins by an *Indulgence*, one owes but it may be 90 years penance for his sins, and another hath run upon the score so far that he owes 900 years, both receive a third part *Indulgence*; in which case, we see plainly the greater sinner hath mightily the advantage of the other, and where one gets but 30 the other gets 300. And therefore *Bonaventure* is fain to run back again, and to say, *that Indulgences are not to be understood as they are expressed, and that they are not equal to all; but it was not fit to express it so, because this would hinder peoples esteem of the Indulgence.* Which in plainer terms is, that it is necessary to cheat the people, or else there is no good to be done by *Indulgences*.

Thence

Thence Petrarch called them *nets*, wherein the credulous multitude were caught; and in the time of Boniface 9. the people, observing what vast summs of money were gathered by them, cryed out they were *meer cheats and tricks* to get money with; upon which *Paulus Langius* (a Monk) exclaims; *O God, to what are these things come! Thou holdest thy peace but thou wilt not alwayes; for the day of the Lord will bring the hidden things of darkness to light.* Conrad. Urspergensis saith, that Rome might well rejoyce in the sins of the people, because she grew rich by the compensation which was made for them: Thou hast (saith he to her) that which thou hast alwayes thirsted after; sing and rejoyce, for thou hast conquered the world, not by religion, but by the wickedness of men. Which is that which draws them to thee, not their devotion and piety. Platina saith, the selling Indulgences brought the Ecclesiastical Authority into contempt, and gave encouragement to many sins. Urspergensis complains, that plenary Indulgences brought more wickedness into the world; for, he saith, men did then say, Let me do what wickedness I will, by them I shall be free from punishment, and deliver the souls of others from Purgatory. Gerson saith, none can give a pardon for so many years, as are contained in the Popes Indulgences, but Christ alone: therefore what are they but cheats and impostures? In Spain, Indulgences were condemned by *Petrus de Osma*, a Divine of Salamanca, and his followers, as appears by the Popes Bull against them, A. D. 1478. In Germany by

Petrarch.  
ep. 5.

Gobel Per-  
sona et. 6.  
c. 68.  
Paul. Langii  
Chron. Ci-  
tinenf. ad  
A.D. 1395.

Ursperg.  
Chron. p.  
307.

Platina in  
Bonif. 9.

Ursperg.  
Chron. p.  
322.

Gerson. de  
Inaug. con-  
fid. 8.

Bull. Rom.  
T. 1.  
Sixt. 4.  
Const. 17.

Serrar. Re-  
van Moyn-  
iac. l. 1.  
c. 34.

Wessellus Gro-  
ning. oper.  
p 867, &c.

*Johannes de Vesaliâ*, a famous Preacher of *Mentz*; for *Serrarius* reckons this among the chief of his opinions, that *Indulgences* were only pious frauds, and trapes to deceive the people, and that they were fools who went to *Rome* for them. About the same time flourished *Wessellus Groningensis*, incomparably the best Scholar of his Age, and therefore called *Lux mundi*; he was not only skilled in *School Divinity* (almost the only learning of that time) but in the *Greek*, *Hebrew*, *Chaldee* and *Arabick*, having travelled into *Greece*, *Ægypt*, and been in most *Universities* of *Europe*, and read the most ancient Authors, in all kinds of learning; on the account of his learning, he was much in favour with *Sixtus 4.* and was present and admired at the *Council of Basil*; but he was so far from being a friend to *Indulgences*, that in his *Epistle* he saith, that no *Popes* could grant an *Indulgence* for an hour, and that it is a ridiculous thing to imagine that for the same thing done, sometimes an *Indulgence* should be granted for 7 years, sometimes for 700, sometimes for 7000, and sometimes for ever by a plenary remission; and that there is not the least foundation in *Scripture*, for the distinction of remitting the fault and the punishment, upon which the doctrine of *Indulgences* is founded. That the giving them, was a design of covetousness; and although the *Pope* once swore to the *King of France's* *Embassador*, that he did not know the corruption of the sellers of *Indulgences*, yet when he did know them he let them alone, and they spread farther. That *God himself* doth not give plenary remission to contrition and confession,

confession, and therefore the Pope can much less do  
 it: But if God doth forgive, how comes the Pope  
 to have power to retain? and if there be no  
 punishment retained when God forgives, what  
 hath the Pope to do to release? Against him  
 writes one *Jacobus Angularis*; he confesseth, *Jac. Angu-*  
 there is nothing in Scripture or Antiquity expressly *lar. in ep.*  
 for Indulgences; but that ought to be no argu- *Wesseli.*  
 ment, for there are many other things owned in  
 their Church, as necessary points, which have as  
 little foundation as this, viz. *S. Peters* being at  
 Rome, and *Sacramental confession*; and therefore  
 at last he takes Sanctuary in the Popes and  
 Churches Authority. To this *Wesselus* answers,  
 "that Indulgences were accounted pious frauds,  
 "before the time of *Albertus* and *Thomas*; that  
 "there was a great number of Divines, did  
 "still oppose the errors and practices of the  
 "Court of Rome, in this matter; that sup-  
 "posing the Church were for them, yet the au-  
 "thority of Scripture is to be preferred before  
 "it, and no multitude of men whatsoever is  
 "to be believed against Scripture: that, he had  
 "not taken up this opinion rashly, but had  
 "maintained it in *Paris* thirty three years be-  
 "fore, and in the Popes penitentiary Court at  
 "Rome, and was now ready to change it, if he  
 "could see better reason for the contrary. That  
 "the doctrine of Indulgences was delivered very  
 "confusedly and uncertainly, by which it ap-  
 "peared to be no *Catholick doctrine*: that it is  
 "almost impossible to find two men agree, in the  
 "explication of them; that the doctrine of In-  
 "dulgences was so far from being firmly believed

“among them, that there was not the strictest  
 “person of the *Carthusian* or other orders  
 “that should receive a *plenary Indulgence* at the  
 “hour of death, that yet would not desire his  
 “*Brethren*, to pray for his soul; which is a  
 “plain argument, he did not believe the vali-  
 “dity of the *Indulgence*: that many in the  
 “*Court of Rome* did speak more freely against  
 “them, than he did. That, the *Popes* authori-  
 “ty is very far from being *infallible*, or being  
 “owned as such in the *Church*; as appeared by  
 “the *Divines at Paris*, condemning the *Bull* of  
 “*Clement 6.* about *Indulgences*, wherein he  
 “took upon him to command the *Angels*, and  
 “gave *plenary remissions* both from the fault  
 “and punishment. Which authentick *Bulls*, he  
 “saith, were then to be seen at *Vienne*, *Limoges*  
 “and *Poitou*. It is notorious to the world, what  
 complaints were made in *Germany*, after his  
 time, of the fraud of *Indulgences*, before any  
 other point of *Religion* came into dispute; and  
 how necessarily from this, the *Popes* authority  
 came to be questioned, that being the only pre-  
 tence they had to justify them by: and with  
 what success these things were then managed,  
 it is no more purpose to write now, than  
 to prove that it is day at Noon. The *Coun-  
 cil of Trent* could not but confess horrible  
 abuses, in the sale of *Indulgences*; yet what  
 amendment hath there been, since that time?  
 Bellarmin confesseth, that it were better if the  
 Church were very sparing in giving *Indul-  
 gences*: I wonder why so, if my Adversaries  
 experience and observation be true, that  
 they

Bell de In-  
 dulg. l. 1.  
 c. 12.

they prove great helps to devotion and charity. Can the Church be too liberal in those things which tend to so good an end?

§. 8. But Bellarmine would not have the people too confident, of the effect of Indulgences; for though the Church may have power to give them, yet they may want their effect in particular persons; and therefore, saith he, all prudent Christians do so receive Indulgences, as withal to satisfy God themselves for their sins, i. e. in plain terms, that all prudent Christians are too wise to believe them, and none but Fools do relye on them. For if there were any thing but fraud and imposture in them, why may not a prudent Christian trust a Church, which he believes infallible? If the Head of the Church publishes an Indulgence, wherein he remits to all that are confessed and contrite, upon doing such actions of charity and piety the remaining temporal punishment of their sins: I desire to know why a prudent Christian of that Church may not, yea, ought not, to rely upon his word? Doth he suspect the Head of his Church may cheat and abuse him? if he doth, what becomes of infallibility? if he verily believes that the Pope cannot err, and will not deceive, why must not his word be taken? and how can his word be taken for the remitting of a debt, when they take as much care of payment, as if he had said nothing? I know not how those things pass among the prudent Christians of that Church, but to me they look like the greatest suspicion of a cheat that may be. As suppose a great person out of kindness to

Of Bellarmine's prudent Christian.

one



one that is in danger of lying in Prison for debt, gives him a note under his hand, that upon the acknowledgement of his debt to his Attourney, and paying him his *Fees*, he will see his debt wholly discharged; and a Friend of the Prisoner tells him *openly*, he ought to receive that Favour in an extraordinary manner, with all thankfulness; for that person is one, who can never fail of his word; and he need not question his ability, for he hath a vast *treasure* in his hands, to be disposed of for such uses; can we otherwise think, but that the poor man would be strangely surpris'd with joy at it; and if he hath any money left, he will be sure to give it to the person imployed in so good a work? But withall if he should *secretly* whisper him, that he advises him as a Friend, that he would look out all other ways imaginable to satisfy his Creditours, and that all *prudent persons*, in his case, had taken the same Course; what must the thoughts of such a man be, of such a large and noble offer? Truly, that the Gentleman was a great Courtier, but a man must have a care of believing him too far; and his Friend understood the world, and that one thing was to be said and done in *shew*, not to disoblige so great a person, but for all that, a man must mind his own business, or he may be choused at last, if he trust too far to such large promises. This is just the case of *Indulgences* in the *Roman Church*; a man is affrighted with the dreadful Prison of *Purgatory*, as the temporal punishment of his sins, which God will certainly exact from him, either here by satisfactions and penances, or there

here in the pains of that state; while the man considers with himself the hardness of his condition, he hears of *Indulgences* to be had; and after he hath enquired the meaning of them; is very well satisfied, that if he can get one of them, he shall do well enough. For he is told that his *Holiness* is *infallible*, and that he cannot cheat or lye, or deceive like other men; and therefore, of all persons in the world, he would soonest trust him; but because many others are in the same condition with him, he may ask a little question, whether his *stock* will hold out or no: here, his friends assure him the *Treasure* of the *Church*, (of which the *Pope* hath the *Keys*) is so large, that if it were a thousand times more, he need not fear it; only he must confess his sins, and have contrition for them, and do some charitable acts, and pay some customary fees and duties, and he shall have a total discharge. Well, says the man, in a transport of joy, this is the bravest *Church* in the world for a man to *sin* in, if he may escape thus: and what need I question, since the *Pope* is *infallible*, and the treasury of the *Church* is inexhaustible? how am I freed now, not only from the fears of *Hell* and *Purgatory*, but from crabbed and hateful penance? that honest and kind-hearted Gentleman, the *Pope*, hath struck a *tilly* for me in his *Exchequer*, and I shall have my share in my course and order; without lashings, and whippings, and fastings, and mumbings, and I know not how many odd tricks besides: but *soft and fair* saith *Bellarmins* prudent *Christian* to him; be not too confident of your case

ease and discharge, you must use as great severities with your self, and undergoe as many penances, and say as many Prayers as if you had no *Indulgence* at all. Say you so, I pray what benefit then have I, saith he, by this which you call an *Indulgence*? what is it an *Indulgence* of? Is there not a *full remission of sins* contained in it? and I have been always told, by that is meant the discharge of the temporary punishment due to sin, either here, or in Purgatory? Shall I be discharged, or shall I not upon it? if I shall, what do you tell me of that which I am discharged from? if not, the *Indulgence* is a *spiritual Trepan*, and the *Pope* an *Infallible Cheat*. I cannot see how a man can think otherwise, that made such account of the great benefit of *Indulgences*, and at last finds they come to nothing, but deceiving the people, and getting money.

The absurdity of the doctrine of *Indulgences*, and the Churches *Treasure*.

*Cassander in consult.*

art. 12.

Barns *Cathol. Rom.*

*Pacific. S. 9.*

*White de*

*medio anim.*

*Stat. u. dem.*

26.

§. 9. By this we see already, what miserable shifts they are put to, who defend *Indulgences* but as an *honest contract*, but they who will justify them, as containing something divine and satisfactory for the punishment of mens sins, are fain to build the doctrine of them upon such absurd and unintelligible notions, that it is almost as hard to understand, as to believe it. It cannot be denied; that there are some in the Church of Rome, whose doctrine of *Indulgences* is easie enough, but then it marrs the whole Market, and this doctrine is therefore condemned by others as *Heretical in sense*: Which is, that *Indulgences* are nothing else but a *relaxation of the ancient severity of Church discipline*, according

according to the old Penitential Canons ; which doth not respect the justice of God, but the Discipline of the Church over offenders. This is a doctrine we have nothing to complain of the difficulty of understanding, but we know not to what purpose, ( if this be all ) any particular *Indulgences* are ever given ; since there is so general an *Indulgence*, by the practice of the whole Church, among them ; wherein, they cannot pretend to observe any of the old Penitential Canons. And to give a man an *Indulgence*, to omit that which no body requires and is wholly out of use, would be like the Kings giving a man a *Patent*, not to wear *Trunk-hose* and *Ruffs*, when it would be ridiculous to use them. And if this were all intended, why is it not so expressed if they meant honestly ? but they know, if their *Pardons* ran so, no one would give a farthing for them. What need any talk of the Churches *Treasure*, for this ? which *Clement. 6.* made the ground of *Indulgences* in his *Bull* : and hath been asserted, by the most zealous defenders of them. This way of explaining *Indulgences* then, though it be easie and intelligible, yet it is not reconcileable with the practice of the Church of Rome ; nor with the suppositions, on which that practice is built. We are therefore to enquire, what they can make of it, who go about to defend it, as it is practised, and generally understood among them. To this end they tell us, “ that although the fault be remitted, “ upon the Sacrament of Penance ; yet the temporal punishment of sin remains, which God “ must be satisfied for : that this temporal “ punishment

"punishment is either to be undergone here, or  
 "in *Purgatory*; that every man must have un-  
 "dergone it himself, if there had not been a  
 "treasure of the *Church* made up of the satisf-  
 "actions of *Christ*, and the *Saints*, to make  
 "amends to *God* for every one, to whom that  
 "Treasure is applyed. That, the dispensing of  
 "this Treasure is in the hands of the *Pope*, who  
 "gives it out by *Indulgences*; which being ap-  
 "plied to any person, upon the condition requi-  
 "red, he is thereby discharged from the debt  
 "of temporal punishment, which he owed to  
 "God.

This is the received doctrine of *Indulgences*,  
 in the *Roman Church*; which holds together  
 till you touch it, and then it presently flies in  
 pieces like a *Glass drop*, or vanishes into smoke  
 and aire. It is of so tender a composition that  
 it can endure no rough handling; if you like it  
 as it is, much good may it do you, but you  
 must ask no *Questions*: But however, I shall;  
 to shew the monstrous absurdities of this Do-  
 ctine.

1. Why, if the *Indulgence* only respects the  
*punishment* and not the *fault*, the terms of the  
*Indulgence* do not express this, that the people  
 may not be deceived? Why in all *Indulgences*  
 since this doctrine is so explained, as in the *Ju-*  
*bilees* of *Clement 8.* and of *Urban 8.* (the for-  
 mer of whom is applauded by *Bellarmin*, for a  
 reformer of *Indulgences*) the most general ex-  
 pressions are still used of most *plenary Indulgence*,  
*remission* and *pardon* of all their sins? why it  
 is not said only of the *temporal punishment due*

*Clem. 8.*  
*const. 58.*  
*Tom 3. Bull.*  
*Urban. 8.*  
*const. 16.*  
*To. 4.*

to sin, the fault being supposed to be remitted?

2. How *punishment* doth become due, when the *fault* is remitted? if the *punishment* be just, it must have respect to the *fault*; for to *punish* without respect to the *fault* is all one, as to *punish* without *fault*; if it have respect to the *fault*, how that fault can be said to be remitted, which is punished? So far as a man is punished, it is nonsense to say he is pardoned; and so far as he is not pardoned, his fault is charged upon him.

3. Suppose temporal punishment remain to be satisfied for; whether all, or only some one kind? whether diseases, pains, and death, be not part of the *temporal punishment* of sin; and whether men may be freed from these, by *Indulgences*? whether from the effects of the justice of God, in extraordinary judgements? if not, how can a man be said to be freed from the temporal punishment of sin, that is as lyable to it as any one else?

4. If only one sort of the temporal punishment of sin, why is not that *one sort* declared what it is, that all men may be satisfied from the *Pope* himself, whom some believe infallible, in his *Indulgence*? Others we find, are not agreed about it; some say, it is only the punishment due to sin above the *Canonical penance*; some, that it is only the *Canonical penance*, and not that which is due from the justice of God; some that it is for both, some only for negligence in performing penance; some that it is only for enjoined penance, and others that it is  
for



all that may be adjoyned. In this diversity of opinions, what security can any man have, what punishment he is to be freed from?

5. If it be from *Canonical penance*, whether a man is wholly freed from the obligation to that, or no? if he be, what power hath the *Priest*, to enjoin *penance* after? if he be not free, what is it he is freed from? and in what tolerable sense can this be called a *most full remission of sins*, which neither remits the *fault*, nor the *natural* or *divine punishment*, nor so much as the *Canonical penance* enjoyned by a *Priest*?

6. Although there needs no *treasure*, where nothing is discharged; yet since so great a one is spoken of for this purpose, wherein the satisfaction of *Christ* bears the greatest share; it were worth the enquiring why the satisfaction of *Christ* might not as well remit the temporal punishment, when the fault is remitted on the account of it, as afterwards by *Indulgences*?

7. How the parts of *Christs* satisfaction come to be divided, into that which was *necessary*, and that which was *redundant*, so as the necessary satisfies for the fault, and the redundant, for the temporal punishment? whether *Christ* did any more, than *God* required? whether any thing which *God* required, can be said to be redundant? if there be, how one part comes to be applyed, and the other cast into a *treasure*? what parts can be made, of an infinite and entire satisfaction? and if so little were necessary, and so much redundant, how the least  
part

part comes to satisfy for the fault and eternal punishment; and the greatest, only for the temporal punishment?

8. Whether all the satisfaction of *Christ* taken together, were not great enough to remit the eternal punishment of the whole World? if it were, whether all the *redundant* parts of that, be cast into a *treasure* too? and who hath the keeping of it, and what *use* is made of so much more useful a *treasure*, than that which serves only to remit the temporal punishment? What account can the *Pope* give of suffering so vast a part of the *Churches Treasure* to lie idle, and make no use of it for the benefit of those that need it?

9. May not the *Pope*, if he thinks of it, gather another mighty *treasure* of the *absolute power of God*, which is never used, as for making new worlds, &c? may he not, by the help of this, deliver souls out of hell, as well as by the other out of *Purgatory*? and if this be so much the greater kindness, he ought to think of it, and imploy this treasure for these purposes. Why may he not think of another treasure of the *light* of the *Sun* that is more than enough for the use of the World, and lay it up in store, for the benefit of the purblind and Aged?

10. If the satisfaction of *Christ* be so redundant, how comes it not to be sufficient for so poor an end as *Indulgences* serve for; but the satisfactions of the *Saints* must make up a share, in this *Treasure* too? Is not this worse, than to light a Candle to help the Sun, to suppose *Christs* satisfaction so infinite, as to

be sufficient to redeem more worlds; and yet not enough to deliver from temporal punishment, without the satisfactions of the *Saints*?

11. How come the *Saints*, to make such large satisfactions to the justice of God, if the satisfaction of *Christ* were of so infinite a nature? and if they did make satisfactions, were they not sufficiently rewarded for them? if they were, how come those satisfactions to help others, which they were so abundantly recompensed for themselves?

12. If the satisfaction of *Christ* doth only obtain grace for the *Saints*, to satisfy themselves for the temporal punishment of their sins; how can the application of this satisfaction by *Indulgences*, free any from the temporal punishment of their sins? Or have the satisfactions of *Saints*, being joyned with *Christs*, greater power now in common penitents, than the satisfaction of *Christ* alone in the greatest *Saints*?

13. Why the satisfaction of *Christ*, may not serve, without the *Saints*, to remit only the temporal punishment of sins; when it was sufficient alone, to remit both eternal and temporal in the Sacrament of Baptism? or was the force of it spent then, that it needs a fresh supply afterwards? but if then it could be applied to a higher end, without any other help, why not where it is to have far less efficacy?

14. If satisfaction be made to God for the temporal punishments of penitents, by *Indulgences*; I desire to know, when and by whom the payment is made to God? If it was made by the

the

the persons, whose satisfactions make the *Churches* treasure, for that end, what hath the *Pope* to do to dispense that, which *God* hath accepted long agoe for payment? If it be made by the *Pope*, in what way doth he make it? doth he take out so much ready *cash* of the *Churches* treasure, and pay it down upon the nail, according to the proportion of every ones sins? or doth he only tell *God*, where such a treasure lyes, and bid him go and satisfie himself, for as much as he discharges of his debt?

15. How came this *Treasure* of the *Church*, into the *Popes* Keeping? who gave him alone the *Keys* of it, if there were any such thing, methinks those, who are trusted with the greater treasure of *Christs* necessary satisfaction for the remitting of eternal punishment, as every *Priest* is by their own doctrine in the *Sacrament* of *Penance*, should not be denyed the lesser, of the *Superfluities* of *Christ* and the *Saints* sufferings, for the remitting only temporal punishment. When I once see these questions satisfactorily answered, I may then think better of this doctrine, than I do at present; for the best I can think of it now is, that there never was a doctrine more absurd in the ground of it, or more gaintful in the practice, than this of *Indulgences* in the *Roman Church*; and therefore ought to be accounted one of the most notorious *cheats*, that ever was in the *Christian* world.

§. 10. But let us suppose it otherwise, and then we are to enquire, whether this would tend to promote or obstruct that very way of devotion, which is most in request in the *Ro-*

The tendency of Indulgences, to hinder devotion.

man Church? there are but two ways to judge of this, either by experience, or the nature of the doctrine it self. For experience, my Adversary alledges his own, and that he hath seen great devotion caused by them: but by his favour the question is not, what outward acts of devotion may be performed by some ignorant and silly people, who are abused by great hopes of strange benefits by Indulgences, and therefore prepare themselves with some shew of devotion to receive them, especially when they are unusual; but the question is, whether they have these effects, upon those who understand the nature and design of them, and the doctrine of their Church about them. For as

*Durand. in  
sentent. l. 4.  
dist. 20. q. 4*

*Durandus* resolves it, the validity of the Indulgence doth not depend, on the devotion of the receiver; for then, saith he, the Indulgence would contain a falsity in it, which is, that who-soever doth such a thing, as going to the seven Churches, shall have plenary remission of his sins: therefore saith he, whoever doth the thing, shall have the whole benefit of the Indulgence, or else the Indulgence is false. And to his experience, I shall oppose, that of greater observers of the world, than he hath been, I have already mentioned the testimony of *Urspergensis*, and others, concerning the effects of plenary Indulgences in their times; how men encouraged themselves to sin the more, because of them *Polydore Virgil* observes, that when Indulgences were grown common, many men did abstain less from doing evil actions. The author of the Book, called *Onus Ecclesiæ* saith, that they

*Polyd. virg.  
de invent.  
rer. l. 8. c. 1.*

*Onus Eccle.  
c. 14. S. 28.*

they take men off from the fruits of repentance, and are profitable only to the idle and wicked. The Princes of Germany, in the Diet of Norimberg among the grievances represented to the Pope, by the consent of them all; upon the mention of *Indulgences* reckon, as the least bad consequence of them, that the people were cheated of their money by them; but that they say was far more considerable, that true Christian Piety was destroyed by them; and that all manner of wickedness did spring from thence; and that men were afraid of committing no kind of sin, when at so cheap a rate they could purchase a remission of them. But setting aside the experience of these things, let us consider what the nature of the doctrine it self tends to, to those who believe it. The least benefit we see allowed them, is a freedom from enjoyned penances; and what are these penances accounted among them, but fruits of true repentance, a severe mortification, fasting, frequent prayers and Alms? so that the short of this doctrine is, that men by *Indulgences* are excused from doing the best parts of their Religion, and if this be a way of promoting devotion, I leave any one in his senses to judge.

§ 11. I proceed now to the denying the Cup to the Laity, contrary to the practice of the Church in the solemn celebration of the Eucharist, for a thousand years after Christ. To which he answers 3. ways (1) that the receiving in one or both kinds was ever held a matter of liberty in the Church. (2) that it was as much in the Churches power to alter it after a thousand years, as in the first or second century, (3) that the

*Centum  
gravamina  
art. 3. 4.*

*Of communion in  
one kind.*



*Pindication*  
*of Arch-*  
*Bishop*  
*Laud. Part.*  
 3 c. 3 s.  
 14. 15, 16,  
 37.

*believing whole Christ to be present in one kind,*  
*tends more to excite devotion, than receiving both*  
*elements without that belief.* This is the sub-  
 stance of his answer. But I have else where at  
 large proved, and need not repeat it here, that  
 the Institution of Christ, as to both kinds, was  
 of an universally obligatory nature, not only  
 from the will of the first Institutor, but from the  
 universal sense of the *Church* concerning the na-  
 ture of that Institution. And there I have largely  
 answer'd, those very testimonies produced by  
 him, and shewed, that they are so far from  
 proving the use of one kind in the *Catholick*  
*Church*, that *Leo* in that very place shewes,  
 that it was the token of an heretick not to receive in  
 both kinds; and the other Instance, in the  
*Greek Church*; is only of a woman in whose  
 mouth the bread turned into a stone, so that  
 she had not patience to stay to receive the Cup.  
 So very pitiful are the proofs, brought against  
 the use of both kinds for a 1000. years after  
*Christ*; which being supposed & acknowledged,  
 by some of the most learned and ingenuous of  
 their own *Church*, I wonder what authority the  
*Church* afterwards can have to alter, what was  
 always looked on before, as on obliging *Insti-*  
*tution of Christ*? Might it not as well alter any  
 other *Institution*, on the same grounds? and  
 wholly forbid the bread to the Laity; as well  
 as the cup; and I do not at all question, but  
 as substantial reasons might be brought for one,  
 as the other. I had thought, the *Gentlemen*  
 of the *Roman Church* had pretended a mighty  
 reverence to *Apostolical Traditions*, and the  
 Practice

*Practice of the Catholick Church, for a thousand years after Christ.* But it seems, this signifies nothing to them, when it is contrary to their present doctrine and practice. Then it makes a great noise, as he saith, but nothing else: Thus we Protestants have at last gained *Antiquity* of our side, it is now yielded that though the Church were for us, for a thousand years, yet if it now decree or act otherwise, this is enough for them. And we are contented to have *Christ* and his *Apostles*, and all the *Primitive practice* for so long a time, on our side; and to leave them to enjoy the satisfaction that follows taking the part of the Church of Rome, against them all. But however *their opinion tends more to devotion?* Alas for us! we do not account it any piece of devotion to believe non-sense, and contradictions such as the doctrine of Transubstantiation implies: we know not what devotion there can be in opposing a plain Institution of *Christ*; and not meerly, in leaving the people at liberty to receive in one or both kinds, but in *prohibiting* the far greatest part of *Christians*, to receive as *Christ* appointed; we know not what devotion there can lie in worshipping a piece of bread for the *Son of God*; and believing, that when a wafer is taken into our mouths, *that God himself is personally entered under our Roof.* O horrible devotion, and detestable superstition! to give the same adoration to a *wafer*, which we do to the *Eternal God*; and to believe *Christ* to go down as personally into our bellies, as ever he went up and down when he was upon earth.

Of the  
Popes  
power of  
dispensing.

§. 12. That which follows is, *the power of a Persons dispensing in oaths and marriages contrary to the Law of God*, which I therefore made a hindrance of the sincerity of devotion, because it is apt to possess mens minds with an apprehension that Religion is only a *Politick Cheat*, if any person shall be thought able to dispense with those things, which are universally received among *Christians* as the *Laws of God*. That which I meant, was the *Popes* taking upon him to dispense with *oaths of Allegiance to Princes*, and the *incestuous marriages of some great Princes*. And now let any one consider what his Answer signifies: he saith, *that some kinds of Oaths may be judged in some circumstances to be hurtful, and not fit to be kept: and the dispensation in them is no more than to judge or determine them to be so: and for Marriages, he adds, that the Church may dispence in some degrees of Affinity and Consanguinity, but in nothing contrary to the Law of God*. But this doth not at all reach to the business; for dispensing in this way may as well be done by a *Casnist*, as the *Bishop of Rome*; but the Question lies here, whether those things which otherwise would be sins by the Law of God, do therefore cease to be so, because of the *Popes* power to discharge that obligation of conscience which lay upon the Person, either in oaths or marriages? Let him answer directly to this; for the other is shuffling, and not answering. As, it is granted that a Subject hath an obligation of Conscience upon him, to obey his Sovereign by vertue of the *Law of God*; and

and the universal sense of the *Church* hath been, that there are some degrees of consanguinity and affinity which it is *Incest* to marry within: I desire to know, whether the *Popes* power can make disobedience *lawful* in one case, and marriage in another, which without that *Power* were utterly unlawful? This he could not but know was the thing meant, but not fit to be answered.

§.13. The last Instance is, making disobedience to the *Church*, in disputable matters, more *hainous*, than disobedience to the *Laws* of *Christ*, in unquestionable things, as marriage in a *Priest*, to be a greater crime than Fornication. To this he answers, 1. That the Law of the *Church* being supposed forbidding the marriage of a *Priest*, that is no disputable matter: but it is out of Question by the Law of God, that obedience is to be given to the commands or prohibitions of the *Church*. 2. That marriage in a *Priest*, the prohibition of the *Church* being supposed, and a voluntary vow against it, is no better than Adultery in the language of the *Fathers*, and therefore worse than Fornication. 3. That the state of single life is much more convenient for *Priests*, than the married state is. This last answer is nothing at all to the purpose; for in matters of convenience, not determined by any Law, every one is left to be his own chooser; but the Case I put, was not between a married life and single life, for we know no harm either in one or the other of these; but every one is to judge, as most tends to the comfort of his life, and the ends of his calling; which hath now far dif-

The ill consequence of asserting marriage in a *Priest*, to be worse than Fornication.

different circumstances, from the *Apostolical* times; which is a sufficient answer to the *Apostles* words, 1 *Cor.* 7. 32. having a particular respect to the state of the *Christian Church*, in that time of unfixedness and persecution: but the opposition was between *marriage* in a *Priest*, and *Fornication*; whether the former were not by them made a greater crime than the latter; and whether this were not dishonour to the *Laws* of *Christ*, to make the breach of a *Constitution* of the *Church*, in a matter left at liberty by the *Law* of *Christ*, a greater crime than the violation of an indisputable *Law* of his? And *St. Paul* hath given a general rule, which equally holds in all Ages of the *Church*, *If they cannot contain let them marry, for it is better to marry than to burn.* So that if *S. Paul* may resolve the case he makes no question, that where there is but danger of *Fornication*, *marriage* is so far from being a greater crime than that, that it becomes a duty to such a one. But hold, say they of the *Church of Rome* to *St. Paul*, *this is only meant of those whom the Church allows to marry; but if the Church once forbid it to any, they are not to marry, let their case be what it will.* Here then lies the dispute between *St. Paul* and them; *St. Paul* saith, to avoid *fornication* a man ought to marry; they say, that to marry, after the prohibition of the *Church*, is worse than *Fornication*: *St. Paul* might it may be ask, *What authority their Church had to determine contrary, to what he had done in this case; Or men to make vows, against the most proper remedy:*

remedy of some of the Infirmities of humane nature, and which God hath not promised to any to keep them from : If obedience to the Church be indisputable, it is only in such things, which God hath not antecedently determin'd by his own Law ; but, in the case between marriage and fornication, God himself hath given a Law before hand, which no Church in the world can reverse. And, however indifferent a thing in the general it be to marry or not ; yet when it comes to that point, either marriage or Fornication, I wonder at the confidence of any, who dare upon any account whatsoever, make marriage a greater crime than Fornication.

But, he saith, it seems strange to them who either cannot or will not take the word of Christ, that is his counsel of chastity, that marriage in a Priest should be a greater sin than Fornication. It doth, I assure you seem strange to us, because we are desirous to keep the Commands of Christ ; and we are sure, marriage is against none of them, but Fornication is. Doth that man take Christs counsel of chastity, that rather chooseth to commit Fornication, than marry ? What admirable chastity is that ? and what a beastly institution must marriage be, if Fornication be a less crime than that ? But what a reflection is this, the mean while, on the Author of it, and that state of innocency and purity wherein it was first appointed : They must needs think themselves very holy men, who look on that state as too impure for them, which was allotted to man in his greatest

In-



*Innocency.* But although the first *Ages* of the *Christian Church* were so full of hardship and difficulties, that if ever it should have been required of the *Governours* of the *Church* to have been above this *state*, it should have been at that time; yet we find no such thing in the *Apostolical* times, or afterwards; when the necessities of affairs would most have required it. But when the *Christian Church* came to have settlement in the world, and by degrees persons were fixed with endowments to particular places, and some care of affairs of the world was necessarily joyned with those of the *Church*; there was far less reason, to make such a prohibition of marriage to the *Clergy* than ever was before. And the *scandals* were so abominable, where those restraints were most in force, that on that very account, the wisest men (though as fond as any, of the *Churches* authority) thought there was more reason to give liberty to *Priests* to marry, than ever there had been to restrain them from it. I am not bound to defend all the extravagant and indiscreet passages, which fell from some of the *Fathers* concerning marriage, but I am sure the *Church* preserved her liberty in it, notwithstanding them; as I might easily prove, if it were suitable to my present design. And

*S. Cyprian* speaking of those *Virgins*, who came nearest to vows of virginity, as *Rigaltius* observes, saith, *that it were better for them to marry, than to fall into hell by their sins; when they either will not, or cannot keep their promise; the same thing is said, by S. Augustin, by Epiphanius*

*Cyprian. ep.*  
62.

nins, by the author of the epistle *ad Demetriadem*, as Bishop Jewel hath long since proved; and need not here be repeated.

Two things he objects, to prove marriage worse than fornication after a vow of continency; one from the authority of *S. Paul*, who saith the younger Widows that marry after the dedicating themselves to the service of the Church, do incurr damnation; because, by so doing they made void their first faith, i. e. as the Fathers expound it, the vow they had made. But doth he really think, that they did not break their first faith and incurr damnation by Fornication, as well as by Marrying? If they did, how can this prove marriage worse than Fornication? I grant, that by their first faith hath been understood the promise made to the Church; and who denies breach of promise, to be a bad and scandalous thing, which is that *S. Paul* means by damnation; and is not Fornication much more so, where a thing in it self evil is committed, besides the breach of the promise? Can any one think, that is not more waxing wanton against Christ, than meer marrying is? Therefore *S. Paul* would have the younger Women to marry, and not make any such promises, which they would be in danger of breaking; he would have none admitted into the condition of Church-widows; but those that were 60. years of age, and so in reason to be supposed passed the temptations to Fornication. Whereby she shews what rule ought to be observed, in all such promises; and that none ought to be brought under them, but such

August. de  
San. Vir.  
ginit. l. c. 34  
Epiph. c.  
bar. 61.  
Hieronym.  
ep. adv.  
demetriad.  
Jewels de-  
fence of the  
Apology  
part. 2.  
p. 174.

1 Tim. 5. 14

v. 52

as

*Bibliotheca  
juris cano-  
nici. p. 317*

*August. de  
bono vidui-  
tat. c. 9. 10.  
II.*

as are to be supposed past the common temptations of humane nature in those things. But his second authority is more to his purpose, (if it were good for any thing,) which is the 104. Canon of the 4. Council of Carthage, as it is called; but he might have found, in *Justellus* his preface to the *Codex Canonum Ecclesie Africanae*, that this 4. Council of Carthage is of no Authority at all; and we need not be concerned for any Canon contained therein, which is not in the Code of the African Church, as this is not; but seems taken out of some *Decretals* of the Popes, as will appear, by comparing the 101. Canon in the Collection of *Cresconius*, with the 104. of his Council. And it would be very strange, if *S. Augustin* were present in this Council, that he should herein oppose, what he had said elsewhere; for he determines, that the marrying again of the widows, that had vowed continuance in that state, was no Adultery, but a lawful marriage; and that husband and wife ought not to be separated from each other, upon such marriages, and by that means, make the husbands truly Adulterers, when they separate from them and marry other wives: and therefore, saith he, that which the Apostle condemns in them, is not so much their marrying as their will to marry, whether they do or no, whereby they break their first faith; So that it is not marriage, but lust which the Apostle condemns; from whence it appears, that *S. Austin* could never, if he spake consonantly to himself, condemn marriage after a vow of continency, to be worse than Fornication. Indeed, he saith,

that

that this falling from that holy chastity which was vowed to God, may in some sense be said to be worse than Adultery; but he never imagined such a construction could be made of his words, as though the act of Fornication were not a greater falling from it, than meer marriage could be.

So much shall suffice for the Instances produced in the Roman Church, of such things which tend to obstruct a good life and devotion.

§. 14. The third Argument I used to prove the danger a person runs of his *salvation* in the communion of the Roman Church, was, because it exposeth the faith of Christians to so great uncertainties; which he looks on as a strange charge from the Pen of a Protestant. As strange as it is, I have at large proved it true, in a full examination of the whole Controversie of the Resolution of Faith between us and them; to which I expect a particular Answer, before this charge be renewed again. To which I must refer him for the main proof of it, and shall here subjoyn only short replies to his Answers; or references to what is fully answered already.

Of the uncertainty of Faith in the Roman Church.

Vindication of Archbishop Land, part. 1. ch. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.

1. His distinction, of the authority of the Scripture in it self and to us, signifies nothing; for when we enquire into the proofs of the Authority of Scripture, it can be understood no otherwise than in respect to us; and if the Scriptures Authority as to us, is to be proved by the Church, and the Churches Authority as to us, to be proved by the Scripture, the

the difficulty is not in the least avoided by that distinction. And as little to the purpose is the other, *that it is only an argument ad hominem, to prove the Infallibility of the Church from Scriptures*; for I would fain know upon what other grounds they build their own belief of the *Churches Infallibility*, than on the *Promises of Christ in the Scriptures*? These are miserable evasions, and nothing else. For the trite saying of *St. Austin*; *that he would not believe the Gospel*, &c. I have at large proved, that the meaning of it is no more, than that the *Testimony of the Universal Church* from the *Apostles times*, is the best way to prove the particular Books of *Scripture* to be *authentic*, and cannot be understood of the *Infallibility of the present Church*, and that the testimony of some few persons, as the *Manichees* were, was not to be taken in opposition to the whole *Christian Church*. Which is a thing we as much contend for, as they; but is far enough from making the *Infallibility of our Faith* to depend on the *Authority of the present Church*, which we say is the way to overthrow all certainty of Faith, to any considering man.

2. To that of overthrowing the certainty of sense in the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, he saith, *that divine Revelation ought to be believed against the evidence of sense*. To which I answer (1.) that divine Revelation, in matters not capable of being judged by our *senses*, is to be believed, notwithstanding any argument can be drawn from sensible

experiments against it, as in the belief of *God*, the doctrine of the *Trinity*, the future state of the soul, &c. (2.) that in the proper objects of sense, to suppose a *Revelation* contrary to the evidence of sense, is to overthrow all certainty of Faith, where the matters to be believed depend upon matters of Fact. As for instance, the truth of the whole *Christian Doctrine* depends upon the truth of *Christ's* resurrection from the dead: if sense be not here to be believed in a proper object of it, what assurance can we have that the *Apostles* were not deceived, when they said they saw *Christ* after he was risen?

If it be said, *there was no revelation against sense in that case*: that doth not take off the difficulty, for the reason why I am to believe *revelation* at any time against sense must be, because sense may be deceived, but revelation cannot; but if I yield to that principle, that sense may be deceived in its most proper object, we can have no infallible certainty by sense at all, and consequently not in that point, that *Christ* is risen from the dead. If it be said, *that sense cannot be deceived, where there is no revelation against it*: I desire to know how it comes to be deceived, supposing a revelation contrary to it? Doth *God* impose upon our senses, at that time? then he plainly deceives us; is it by telling us, we ought to believe more than we see? that we deny not, but we desire only to believe according to our senses, in what we do see; as that what we see to be bread, is bread; that what the *Apostles* saw to



be the body of *Christ*, was the *body* of *Christ* really, and substantially, and not merely the accidents of a body. Besides, if revelation is to be believed against sense, then either that revelation is conveyed immediately to our minds, which is to make every one a Prophet that believes Transubstantiation; or mediately by our senses, as in those words *this is my body*: if so, then I am to believe this revelation by my senses, and believing this revelation, I am not to believe my senses: which is an excellent way of making Faith certain. All this on supposition there were a revelation in this case, which is not only false, but if it were true would overthrow the certainty of Faith.

3. To what I objected, as to their denying to men the use of their judgment and reason as to the matters of Faith proposed by a Church, when they must use it in the choice of a Church, he answers, *that this cannot expose Faith to any uncertainty, because it is only preferring the Churches judgment before our own*: but he doth not seem to understand the force of my objection, which lay in this. Every one must use his own judgment and reason, in the choice of the *Church* he is to rely upon; is he certain in this or not? if he be uncertain, all that he receives on the *Authority* of that *Church*, must be uncertain too: if the use of reason be certain, then how comes the *Authority* of a *Church* to be a necessary means of certainty in matters of Faith? And they, who condemn the use of a mans reason and judgment in *Religion*, must overthrow all certainty on their own grounds; since

since the choice of his *Infallible Guide* must depend upon it. Now that he understands my argument better, he may know better how to answer it: but I assure him I meant no such thing by the use of reason, *as he supposes I would have, which is to believe nothing, but what my reason can comprehend*; for I believe an Infinite Being, and all the Doctrines revealed by it in *Holy Scriptures*, although I cannot reconcile all particulars concerning them to those conceptions we call reason. But therefore to argue against the use of mens judgements in matters of faith, and the grounds of believing, is to dispute against that, which all wise men ever did, and will do to the worlds end.

4. I proved, they made faith uncertain, by making the *Churches* power to extend to the making new articles of faith. This he grants to be to the purpose, *if it were true*: but he saith, *the Church never owned any such power in her General Councils*, (which doth not hinder but that the *Heads* of their *Church* have pretended to it; and in case it be disputable among them, whether the *Pope* be not *infallible*, that unavoidably leaves faith at uncertainties.) Yet he yields what I contend for, which is, *that it is in the Churches Power, to make that necessary to be believed, which was not so before*: for whether it be by inventing new *Articles*, or declaring more explicitly the *Truths* not contained in *Scripture* and *Tradition*, it is all one to my purpose; as long as men might be saved without believing them before; and cannot afterwards; which

is to make the conditions of salvation *mutable*, according to the pleasure of the *Church*, which is the greatest inconveniency of inventing *new doctrines*.

5. I shewed, they made faith uncertain by pretending to infallibility in determining Controversies, and yet not using it to determine those which are on foot among themselves. The force of the argument did not lie in this as he imagines, *as though faith could not be certain, unless all controversies were determined*, which was far from my thoughts; but, that pretending there can be no faith without *infallibility* in their *Church* to end Controversies, they should give such great occasion to suspect that they did not believe themselves by not imploying that *Infallibility* in ending the great Controversies among themselves; of which I have spoken already, and to this he gives no answer at all.

Thus much in Vindication of the third Argument, I made use of to prove, that all those who are in the Communion of the *Roman Church*, do run so great a hazard of their salvation, that none who have a care of their souls ought to embrace or continue in it.

The case of  
a revolter,  
and a bred  
Papist,  
compared.

§. 15. I now come to the third answer to the first Question, which was, *that a Protestant leaving the Communion of our Church, doth incur a greater guilt, than one who was bred up in the communion of the Church of Rome, and continues therein by invincible Ignorance, and therefore cannot equally be saved with such a one.* Three things he objects against this Answer,  
1. *That this makes them both damned, though*  
unc-

*unequally; because the Converted Catholick more deeply, than he that was bred so. 2. That this reflects as much upon St. Austin as them, who rejected the Communion of the Manichees, and embraced that of the Church of Rome upon their grounds. 3. That it is contrary to our distinction, of points fundamental and not fundamental. To which I Reply.*

1. That the design of my Answer was not, to pass the sentence of damnation on all who dye in the communion of the *Roman Church*; but to shew, that they who forsook a *better Church* for it do incur greater guilt, than those who are always *bred up* in it, and live and dye in the belief of its being the *true Church*; and therefore, are not in an *equal capacity* of *salvation* with them. I shall make my meaning more plain, by a parallel Instance or two; many in the *Church of Rome* have asserted the possibility of the *Salvation of Heathens* (though some *Bigots* have denied it to *Protestants*) suppose this question were put, concerning two persons: *Whether a Christian, having the same motives to become a Heathen, which one bred and born and well grounded in Heathenism hath to remain in it, may not equally be saved in the profession of it?* and a third person should answer, *that a Christian, leaving the communion of the Christian Church, doth incur a greater guilt, than one who was bred up in Heathenism, and continues therein by invincible Ignorance: doth this answer imply, that they must both be damned though equally?* or rather, doth it not yield a greater possibility of *salvation*

tion to one than to the other? Or suppose, (to come nearer our case) the question were put, concerning one that *revolted* from the *Church of Judah* to the *ten Tribes*, (which were guilty of *Idolatry*, though not of the highest kind,) whether he were equally capable of salvation with one, who was *bred up* in the communion of the *Church of Israel* all his days? I should make no question, to pronounce his condition more dangerous than the other; and yet not therein *damn them both*, but only imply that it was much harder for one to escape than the other. For he that was bred up in the *Church of Israel*, believing it was the true *God* he served, and in a right manner, and looking on the *Church of Judah* as a *Schismatical Church*, and seeing the greater number of Tribes on their side, and wanting that instruction which was in the *Church of Judah*, might in the sincerity of his heart serve *God* in a false way, and pray to him to pardon all his errors and corruptions, and have a general repentance of all sins, though not particularly convinced of the *Idolatry* of the *ten Tribes*, I dare not say, but *God* will accept of such a one, *that thus fears God and works Righteousness* in the simplicity of his heart: but I cannot say the same, of one who revolts from *Judah*; where the *true God* was worshipped in a *true manner*; where he had sufficient means of instruction, and either wilful Ignorance, or temporal ends, or unreasonable prejudices makes him deliberately choose a worse and more impure *Church* before a better; for that very sin makes his case much more dangerous, than the other.

other. Our business is not, to enquire into the *salvation* or *damnation* of any particular persons; for that depends upon so many circumstances, as to the aggravation or extenuation of their faults, the nature and sincerity of their repentance, the integrity and simplicity of their minds; which none but *God* himself can know: but to find out the *truest way to salvation*, and to reject, whatever the *Church* requires, that which is in it self sinful; for though *God* may pardon those who live in it in the simplicity of their minds, yet their hopes lying in their *Ignorance* and *repentance*, none who have a care of their souls dare venture themselves in so hazardous a state. Setting aside then the consideration of the danger common to both, I say the case of a *Revolt*er from us to the *Church* of *Rome* is much worse, than of one who was always bred up in it; because he might far more easily understand the danger he runs into, and wilful *Ignorance* only keeps him from it, and he doth upon deliberation choose a state of infinite hazard before one of the greatest safety.

2. This doth not reflect on *St. Austin* or the *Church* in his time, which was as far different from theirs, as the *Churches* of *Judah* and *Israel* were from each other: neither can it destroy the distinction, of *Fundamentals* and not *Fundamentals*; for the possibility of *salvation* allowed to any in their *Church*, is built upon the supposition that they have all that is *fundamentally necessary* in order to it, though there are many dangerous errors and corruptions in that



The mo-  
tives of the  
Roman  
Church  
considered.

*Church* whose communion they live in.  
§. 16. The Answers to the first Question being thus vindicated; there remains little to be added concerning the second. For he tells me, *that he agrees so far with me, that every Christian is bound to choose the communion of the purest Church. But which that Church is, must be seen by the grounds it brings to prove the doctrines it teaches, to have been delivered by Christ and his Apostles.* And to be even with him, I thus far agree with him, in the way of proof of a Churches purity, viz. by agreement with the doctrine of Christ & his Apostles; and that that Church is to be judged purest, which shews the greatest evidence of that consent; and *that every one is bound to enquire, which Church hath the strongest Motives for it, and to embrace the communion of it.*

Being thus far agreed, I must now enquire into what motives he offers on behalf of their Church, and what method he prescribes for delivering ours. For the former, he produces a large Catalogue of Catholick Motives (as he calls them) in the words of Dr. Taylour, *Liberty of Prophecy*, Sect: 20. And I do not know a better way of answering them, than in the words of the same eminent and learned Person, which he uses upon a like occasion to his demonstrating Friend J. S. "But now in my Conscience, (saith the Bishop) "this was unkindly done, that when I had "spoken for them what I could, and more "than I knew they had ever said for them- "selves, and yet to save them harmless from "the iron hands of a tyrant and unreasonable "power,

Preface to  
the second  
part of his  
dissuasive.

“power, to keep them from being persecuted for their errors and opinions, that they should take the Arms I had lent them for their defence, and throw them at my head. But the best of it is, though J.S. be unthankful, yet the Weapons themselves are but wooden Daggers, intended only to represent, how the poor men are couzened by themselves; and that under fair and fraudulent pretences even pious well meaning men, men wise enough in other things may be abused. And though what I said, was but tinsel and pretence, imagery and whipt Cream, yet I could not be blamed to use no better than the best their Cause could bear: yet if that be the best they have to say for themselves, their probabilities will be soon out-ballanced by one Scripture-testimony urged by Protestants, and *thou shalt not Worship any graven Images*, will out-weigh all the best and fairest Imaginations of their Church.— But then J.S. might, if he had pleased, have considered, that I did not intend to make that harangue, to represent that the Roman Religion had probabilities of being true, but probabilities that the Religion might be tolerated, or might be endured: and if I was deceived, it was but a well meant error, hereafter they shall speak for themselves; only for their comfort, this they might have also observed in that Book, that there is not half so much excuse for the Papists, as there is for the Anabaptists, and yet it was but an excuse at the best. But since from me, saith he, they borrow

Polemical  
discourses  
p 705. &c.

“row their light Armour, which is not  
 “Pistol-proof, from me if they please they  
 “may borrow a remedy to undeceive them,  
 “and that in the same kind and way of ar-  
 “guing; for which he refers to a letter writ-  
 ten by him to a Gentlewoman, seduced to  
 the *Church of Rome*; out of which I shall  
 transcribe so much as may over-balance  
 the probabilities produced elsewhere by him.  
 “After directions given, rather to enquire  
 “what her *Religion* is than what her *Church*  
 “is, for that which is a true *Religion* to day,  
 “will be so to morrow and for ever, but that  
 “which is a holy *Church* to day, may be He-  
 “retical at the next change, or may betray  
 “her trust, or obtrude new Articles in con-  
 “tradiction to the old, &c. and shewing the  
 unreasonableness of believing the Roman to  
 be the Catholick Church; he descends thus  
 to particulars. “You are now gone to a  
 “Church that protects it self by arts of sub-  
 “tlety and arms, by violence and persecu-  
 “ting all that are not of their minds: to a  
 “Church, in which you are to be a subject  
 “of the King, so long as it pleases the Pope:  
 “In which you may be absolved from your  
 “Vows made to God, your Oaths to the  
 “King, your promises to Men, your Duty  
 “to your Parents in some cases: a Church  
 “in which men Pray to God and to Saints,  
 “in the same Form of words in which they  
 “Pray to God; as you may see in the Of-  
 “fices of Saints, and particularly of our La-  
 “dy; a Church in which men are taught, by  
 “most

“most of the principal Leaders, to Worship  
“Images with the same Worship with which  
“they Worship God or Christ, or him or her,  
“whose Image it is, and in which they usual-  
“ly picture God the Father and the Holy  
“Trinity, to the great dishonour of that Sa-  
“cred mystery, against the doctrine and pra-  
“ctice of the primitive Church, against the  
“express doctrine of Scripture, against the  
“honour of a divine Attribute; I mean the  
“immensity, and spirituality of the divine  
“nature: You are gone to a Church, that  
“pretends to be infallible, and yet is infi-  
“nitely deceived in many particulars, and yet  
“endures no contradiction, and is impatient  
“her Children should enquire into any thing  
“her Priests obtrude. You are gone from  
“receiving the whole Sacrament, to receive  
“it but half; from Christs Institution, to a  
“humane Invention; from Scripture, to un-  
“certain Traditions; and from ancient Tra-  
“dition, to new pretences; from Prayers  
“which ye understood, to Prayers which ye  
“understand not; from confidence in God, to  
“rely upon Creatures; from intire dependance  
“upon inward acts, to a dangerous tempta-  
“tion of resting too much in outward mini-  
“steries, in the external work of Sacraments  
“and Sacramentals. You are gone from a  
“Church, whose Worshipping is simple, Chri-  
“stian, and Apostolical, to a Church where  
“mens Consciences are loaden with a burden  
“of Ceremonies, greater than that in the days  
“of the Jewish Religion (for the Ceremonial

“ of the Church of *Rome* is a great Book in  
“ Folio.) You are gone from a Church, where  
“ you were exhorted to read the Word of  
“ God, the Holy Scriptures, from whence you  
“ found instruction, institution, comfort, re-  
“ proof, a treasure of all excellencies, to a  
“ Church that seals up that fountain from  
“ you, and gives you drink by drops, out of  
“ such Cisterns as they first make, and then  
“ stain, and then reach out: and if it be told  
“ you, that some men abuse Scripture, it is  
“ true; for if your Priests had not abused Scrip-  
“ ture, they could not thus have abused you;  
“ but there is no necessity they should, and  
“ you need not unless you list; any more  
“ than you need to abuse the Sacrament; or  
“ Decrees of the Church, or the messengers of  
“ your friend, or the Letters you receive, or  
“ the Laws of the Land, all which are lyable  
“ to be abused by evil persons, but not by good  
“ people and modest understandings. It is  
“ now become a part of your Religion, to be  
“ Ignorant, to walk in blindness, to believe  
“ the man that hears your Confessions, to hear  
“ none but him, not to hear God speaking but  
“ by him, and so you are liable to be abus-  
“ ed by him, as he please, without remedy.  
“ You are gone from us, where you are only  
“ taught to worship God through Jesus Christ,  
“ and now you are taught to Worship Saints  
“ and Angels, with a Worship at least dan-  
“ gerous and in some things proper to God;  
“ for your Church Worships the *V. Mary* with  
“ burning Incense and Candles to her, and  
you

“ you give her presents which by the consent  
“ of all Nations used to be esteemed a Worship  
“ peculiar to God , and it is the same thing  
“ which was condemned in the *Collyridians* ,  
“ who offered a Cake to the *V. Mary.*.. A Can-  
“ dle and a Cake make no difference in the  
“ Worship ; and your joyning God and the  
“ Saints, is like the device of them that sought  
“ for King and Parliament ; the latter destroys  
“ the former. To which he subjoyns , that  
“ the points of difference, between us and the  
“ Church of *Rome*, are such as do evidently serve  
“ the ends of Covetousness and Ambition in  
“ them : and that very many of her Doctrines  
“ are very ill Friends to a good life, and that  
“ our Religion is incomparably beyond theirs  
“ in point of safety : as in point of Praying to  
“ God alone , and without Images , relying  
“ on God as infallible, which are surely law-  
“ ful ; but it is at least hugely disputable ,  
“ and not at all certain, than any man or socie-  
“ ty of men can be infallible, that we may put  
“ our trust in Saints, or Worship Images, &c.  
“ From whence he concludes ; So that unless  
“ you mean to prefer a danger before safety,  
“ temptation to unholiness before a severe and  
“ holy Religion ; unless you mean to lose the  
“ benefit of your prayers, by praying what  
“ you perceive not, and the benefit of the Sacra-  
“ ment in great degrees, by falling from Christs  
“ Institution , and taking half instead of all ;  
“ unless you desire to provoke God to jealou-  
“ sie by Images, and man to jealousy in profes-  
“ sing a Religion, in which you may in many  
“ cases



"cases have leave to forfeit your faith and  
 "lawful trust, unless you will choose a Ca-  
 "techism without the second Commandment,  
 "and a faith that grows bigger or lesser as  
 "men please, and to hope that in many de-  
 "grees relies on men and vain confidences, and  
 "a Charity that damns all the world but your  
 "selves, unless you will do all this, that is,  
 "suffer an abuse in your Prayers, in the Sa-  
 "crament, in the commandments, in faith,  
 "in hope, in Charity, in the Communion of  
 "Saints, and your duty to your Supream, you  
 "must return to the bosom of your Mother  
 "the Church of *England*, and I doubt not  
 "but you will find the comfort of it in all  
 "your life, and in the day of your death, and  
 "in the day of Judgement.

Thus far that excellent person, and I leave  
 you now to judge between the Motives on  
 both sides, as they are laid down by him: whom  
 my Adversary appeals to; and I must thank  
 him for the kindness of mentioning him against  
 me, without which I had wanted so good a  
 representation of the Motives of either side,  
 and so full an Answer to the pretences brought  
 for the *Church of Rome*. The other Motives  
 which he adds of *Fathers, Councils and Tra-*  
*dition*, he knows are utterly denied by us;  
 and I wonder he should insist upon them,  
 since in the matters of our debate, *Antiquity*  
 is so evidently of our side, as against Worship  
 of Images and Saints, against Purgatory, Tran-  
 substantiation, Prayers in an unknown tongue;  
 and he thinks it no great matter to allow us  
 a thous-

a thousand years against communion in one kind, and yet all this while *Scripture Fathers, Councils and Tradition* are all on their side. For the *testimony of the present Church*; we deny that *S. Austin* speaks of it, as of it self sufficient; and though he did, that concerns not the *Roman Church*, any more than other parts of the *Catholick Church*; and he may as soon prove *Tyber* to be the *Ocean*, or *St. Peters* at *Rome* to have been before the *Temple at Hierusalem*, as prove the *Roman Church* to be the *Catholick Church*, or the *Mother of all others*.

§. 17. But I must conclude, with the method he prescribes to you for satisfaction from me; which is not to meddle with particular disputes, (which we know very well the reason of) but to call upon me for a Catalogue of our grounds, and to bring things to Grounds and Principles (as they have learnt to Cant of late) and then, he saith, *Controversie will soon be at an end*. I should be glad to see it so; notwithstanding his Friend *J. S.* accounts it so noble a Science, unless he hath changed his mind, since for so many years now, he hath failed in the Defence of his *Demonstrations*. But to satisfy the men of Principles, and to let them see we can do more than find fault with their Religion, I shall give an account of the Faith of Protestants in the way of Principles; and of the reason of our rejecting their impositions, which is all we can understand by Negative Points; and if we can give an account of the Christian Faith, independently on their Churches Authority and Infallibility, it evidently follows,

The Faith  
of Prote-  
stants re-  
duced to  
Principles.

follows, that cannot be the *foundation* of Faith, and so we may be very *good Christians*, without having any thing to do with the *Church of Rome*. And I know no other Answer necessary, not only to this present demand, but to a Book called *Protestants without Principles*, the falsity of which will appear by what follows.

---

*Principles*

---

## *Principles Agreed on both sides.*

1. **T**hat there is a *God*, from whom man, and all other Creatures had their Being.

2. That the notion of God doth imply, that he is a Being absolutely perfect, and therefore Justice, Goodness, Wisdom, and Truth must be in him, to the highest degree of perfection.

3. That man receiving his Being from God, is thereby bound to obey his will; and consequently, is liable to punishment in case of disobedience.

4. That in order to mans obeying the will of God, it is necessary that he know what it is; for which, some manifestation of the will of God is necessary, both that man may know what he hath to do, and that God may justly punish him, if he do it not.

5. Whatever God reveals to man is infallibly true, and being intended for the rule of mans obedience may be certainly known to be his Will.

6. God cannot act contrary to those essential Attributes of Justice, Wisdom, Goodness and Truth, in any way which he makes choice of, to make known his will unto man by.

*These things being agreed on both sides, we are now to inquire into the particular ways which God hath made choice of, for revealing his will to mankind.*

1. **A**N entire obedience to the will of God being agreed to be the condition of mans happiness, no other way of Revelation is in it self necessary to that end, than such whereby man may know what the will of God is.

2. Man being framed a rational Creature, capable of reflecting upon himself, may antecedently to any external Revelation certainly know the Being of God, and his dependance upon him, and those things which are naturally pleasing unto him; else there could be no such thing as a Law of Nature, or any principles of Natural Religion.

3. All supernatural and external Revelation, must suppose the truth of natural Religion, for unless we be antecedently certain that there is a God, and that we are capable of knowing him, it is impossible to be certain that God hath revealed his will to us by any supernatural means.

4. Nothing ought to be admitted for Divine Revelation, which overthrows the certainty of those Principles which must be antecedently supposed to all Divine Revelation

For

For that were to overthrow the means, whereby we are to Judge concerning the truth of any Divine Revelation.

5. There can be no other means imagined, whereby we are to judge of the truth of divine Revelation, but a Faculty in us discerning truth and falshood, in matters proposed to our belief; which if we do not exercise in Judging the truth of Divine Revelation, we must be imposed upon by every thing which pretends to be so.

6. The pretence of Infallibility, in any person or Society of men, must be Judged in the same way, that the truth of a Divine Revelation is; for that Infallibility being challenged by vertue of a supernatural assistance, and for that end, to assure men what the will of God is, the same means must be used for the trial of that, as for any other supernatural way of Gods making known his Will to men.

7. It being in the power of God, to make choice of several ways of revealing his will to us, we ought not to dispute from the Attributes of God the necessity of one particular way, to the Exclusion of all others; but we ought to enquire, what way God himself hath chosen: and whatever he hath done, we are sure cannot be repugnant to Infinite Justice, Wisdom, Goodness, and Truth.

8. Whatever way, is capable of certainly conveying the will of God to us, may be made choice of by him for the means of



making known his will , in order to the happiness of mankind ; so that no Argument can be sufficient *a priori* to prove, that God cannot choose any particular way to reveal his mind by, but such which evidently proves the insufficiency of that means for conveying the Will of God to us.

9. There are several ways conceivable by us, how God may make known his will to us; either by immediate voice from Heaven, or inward inspiration to every particular person; or inspiring some to speak personally to others, or assisting them with an infallible spirit in Writing such Books, which shall contain the Will of God for the Benefit of distant Persons and future Ages.

10. If the Will of God cannot be sufficiently declared to men by Writing, it must either be, because no Writing can be intelligible enough for that end, or that it can never be known to be Written by men infallibly assisted; the former is repugnant to common sense, for words are equally capable of being understood, spoken, or written; the latter overthrows the possibility of the Scriptures being known to be the Word of God.

11. It is agreed among all Christians, that although God in the first Ages of the World did reveal his mind to men immediately by a voice or secret inspirations; yet afterwards he did communicate his mind to some immediately inspired to Write his

his Will, in Books to be preserved for the benefit of future Ages ; and particularly , that these Books of the New Testament which we now Receive were so Written, by the Apostles and Disciples of Jesus Christ.

12. Such Writings having been received by the *Christian* Church of the first Ages as Divine and Infallible , and being delivered down as such to us , by an universal consent of all Ages since , they ought to be owned by us as the certain rule of faith ; whereby we are to Judge , what the Will of God is in order to our Salvation ; unless it appear , with an evidence equal to that whereby we believe those Books to be the Word of God, that they were never intended for that end, because of their obscurity or imperfection.

13. Although we cannot argue against any particular way of Revelation , from the necessary Attributes of God ; yet such a way as writing being made choice of by him, we may justly say, that it is repugnant to the nature of the design , and the Wisdom and Goodness of God to give infallible assurance to persons in Writing his Will , for the benefit of Mankind , if those Writings may not be understood by all persons, who sincerely endeavour to know the meaning of them ; in all such things as are necessary for their salvation.

14. To suppose the Books so Written to be imperfect, *i. e.* that any things necessary to be believed or practised are not contained in them, is either to charge

the first Author of them with fraud, and not delivering his whole mind, or the Writers with insincerity in not setting it down, and the whole Christian Church of the first Ages with folly, in believing the Fulness and Perfection of the Scriptures, in order to Salvation.

15. These Writings being owned, as containing in them the whole Will of God, so plainly revealed, that no sober enquirer can miss of what is necessary for salvation; there can be no necessity supposed of any infallible Society of men, either to attest, or explain these Writings among Christians; any more, than there was for some Ages before *Christ*; of such a Body of men among the *Jews*, to attest or explain to them the Writings of *Moses* or the *Prophets*.

16. There can be no more intolerable usurpation upon the faith of *Christians*; than for any Person or Society of men, to pretend to an assistance, as infallible in what they propose, as was in *Christ* or his *Apostles*, without giving an equal degree of evidence, that they are so assisted; as *Christ* and his *Apostles* did, viz. by miracles as great, publick, and convincing as theirs were; by which I mean, such as are wrought by those very persons who challenge this infallibility; and with a design for the conviction of those who do not believe it.

17. Nothing can be more absurd, than to pretend the necessity of such an infallible commission and assistance, to assure us of the truth of these writings, and to interpret them,  
and

and at the same time to prove that commission from those writings, from which we are told nothing can be certainly deduced, such an assistance not being supposed, or to pretend, that infallibility in a body of men, is not as liable to doubts and disputes, as in those Books from whence only they derive their infallibility.

18. There can be no hazard to any person, in mistaking the meaning of any particular place in those Books, supposing he use the best means for understanding them, comparable to that which every one runs, who believes any person or society of men to be infallible, who are not: for in this latter, he runs unavoidably into one great error, and by that may be led into a thousand; but in the former, God hath promised either he shall not erre, or he shall not be damned for it.

19. The assistance which God hath promised to those, who sincerely desire to know his will, may give them greater assurance of the Truth of what is contained in the Books of Scripture, than it is possible for the greatest infallibility in any other persons to do, supposing they have not such assurance of their infallibility.

20. No mans Faith can therefore be infallible, meerly because the Proponent is said to be infallible; because the nature of *Assent* doth not depend upon the objective intallibility of any thing without us, but is agreeable to the evidence we have of it in our minds; for assent is not built on the nature of things, but their evidence to us.

21. It is therefore necessary in order to an infallible assent, that every particular person be infallibly assisted in Judging of the matters proposed to him to be believed; so that the ground, on which a necessity of some external infallible Proponent is asserted, must rather make every particular person infallible, if no divine Faith can be without an infallible assent, and so renders any other infallibility useless.

22. If no particular person be infallible, in the assent he gives to matters proposed by others to him, then no man can be infallibly sure that the Church is infallible; and so the Churches infallibility can signifie nothing to our infallible assurance, without an equal infallibility in our selves in the belief of it.

23. The infallibility of every particular person being not asserted by those who plead for the infallibility of a Church, and the one rendering the other useless (for if every person be infallible, what need any representative Church to be so) and the infallibility of a Church being of no effect, if every person be not infallible in the belief of it; we are farther to inquire, what certainty men may have in matters of Faith, supposing no external proponent to be infallible.

24. There are different degrees of certainty to be attained, according to the different degrees of evidence, and measure of divine assistance; but every Christian, by the use of his reason, and common helps of Grace, may attain to so great a degree of certainty, from the

the convincing argument of the Christian Religion and authority of the Scriptures; that on the same grounds, on which men doubt of the truth of them, they may as well doubt of the truth of those things which they judge to be most evident, to sense or reason.

25. No man, who firmly assents to any thing as true, can at the same time entertain any suspicion of the falshood of it; for that were to make him certain and uncertain of the same thing: it is therefore absurd to say that those who are certain of what they believe, may at the same time not know but it may be false; which is an apparent contradiction, and overthrows any faculty in us of judging of truth or falshood.

26. Whatever necessarily proves a thing to be true, doth at the same time prove it impossible to be false; because it is impossible the same thing should be true and false at the same time. Therefore they who assent firmly to the doctrine of the Gospel as true, do thereby declare their belief of the Impossibility of the falshood of it.

27. The nature of certainty doth receive several names, either according to the nature of the proof or the degrees of the assent. Thus *moral certainty* may be so called, either as it is opposed to *Mathematical evidence*, but implying a firm assent upon the highest evidence that Mortal things can receive: or as it is opposed to a higher degree of certainty, in the same kind; so Moral certainty implies only



only greater *probabilities* of one side than the other ; in the former sense, we assert the *certainly* of Christian Faith to be *moral*, but not only in the latter.

28. A Christian being thus certain to the highest degree of a firm assent, that the Scriptures are the Word of God, his Faith is thereby resolved into the Scriptures, as into the rule and measure of what he is to believe ; as it is into the veracity of God, as the ground of his believing what is therein contained.

29. No Christian can be obliged under any pretence of infallibility, to believe any thing as a matter of Faith, but what was revealed by God himself, in that Book wherein he believes his will to be contained; and consequently he is bound to reject whatsoever is offered to be imposed upon his Faith, which hath no foundation in Scripture, or is contrary thereto; which rejection, is no making *Negative Articles of Faith*, but only applying the general grounds of Faith to particular instances ; as, because I believe nothing necessary to salvation, but what is contained in Scripture, therefore no such particular things which neither are there nor can be deduced thence.

30. There can be no better way to prevent mens mistakes in the sense of Scripture, (which men being fallible are subject to) than the considering the consequence of mistaking, in a matter wherein their salvation is concerned: and there can be no sufficient reason given why that may not serve in matters of Faith, which God himself hath made use of, as the means

means to keep men from sin in their lives : unless any imagine , that errors in opinion are far more dangerous to mens souls than a vitious life is ; and therefore that God is bound to take more care to prevent the one, than the other.

*It followeth that ,*

1. There is no necessity at all, or use, of an infallible Society of men , to assure men of the truth of those things; which they may be certain of without it ; and cannot have any greater assurance , supposing such infallibility to be in them.

2. The infallibility of that Society of men, who calls themselves the Catholick Church , must be examined by the same faculties in man, the same rules of tryal , the same motives , by which the infallibility of any divine revelation is.

3. The less convincing the miracles , the more doubtful the marks , the more obscure the sense of , either what is called the Catholick Church , or declared by it , the less reason hath any Christian , to believe upon the account of any, who call themselves by the name of the *Catholick Church*.

4. The more absurd any opinions are , and repugnant to the first principles of sense and reason , which any *Church* obtrudes upon the faith of men ; the greater reason men still have , to reject the pretence of infallibility in that Church , as a grand imposture.

5. To

5. To disown, what is so taught by such a Church, is not to question the veracity of God, but so firmly to adhere to it, as to what he hath revealed in Scriptures, that men dare not out of love to their souls reject what is so taught.

6. Though nothing were to be believed as the will of God, but what is by the Catholick Church declared to be so; yet this doth not at all concern the *Church of Rome*, which neither is the *Catholick Church*, nor any sound part or member of it. This may suffice, to shew the validity of the principles, on which the faith of Protestants stands, and the weakness of those of the *Church of Rome*.

From all which it follows, that it can be nothing but wilful Ignorance, weakness of Judgment, strength of prejudice, or some sinful passion, *which makes any one* forsake the Communion of the Church of England, to embrace that of the Church of *Rome*.

F I N I S.



*Books Printed for, and sold by, Henry  
Mortlock, at the Phoenix in S. Pauls  
Church-Yard, and at the White  
Heart, in Westminster-Hall.*

**A** Rational account of the grounds of Pro-  
testant Religion, being a vindication  
of the Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury's* Rela-  
tion of a Conference, &c. From the pretend-  
ed Answer of T. C. by *Edward Stillingfleet*,  
D. D. Folio.

Observations upon Millitary and Political  
affairs, written by the most honourable *George*  
Duke of *Albemarle*, and published by Autho-  
rity. Fo.

*Irenicum*, A weapon salve for the Churches  
wounds, or the Divine right of Forms of  
Church government Examined and Discus-  
sed. Quarto.

*Origines Sacrae*; Or a Rational account of  
the grounds of Christian Faith, as to the Truth  
and Divine Authority of the Scriptures, and the  
matters therein contained: both by *Edward*  
*Stillingfleet*, D. D. Quarto.

*Knowledge and Practice*, or a plain Discourse  
of the Chief things, necessary to be known, belie-  
ved

ved and practised in order to salvation, by  
*S. Cradock*, necessary for all Families. *Quarto.*

A Sermon Preached before the KING,  
January 30, 1668. By *Edward Stillingfleet*,  
D. D. *Quarto.*

*Six Sermons*, with a Discourse annext concerning the true Reason of the Sufferings of Christ, wherein *Crellins* his Answer to *Grotius* is considered by *Edward Stillingfleet*, D. D. in *Octavo.*

The Being and Well-being of a Christian, in three Treatises, the first setting forth the properties of the Righteous: the second, The Excellency of Grace: the Third, The Nature and Sweetness of Fellowship with Christ; by *Edward Reyner* late Minister at *Lincoln*, published by his son *I. Reyner*. *Octavo.*

The Triumphs of *Rome* over despised Protestantcy, by *Bithop Hall*. *Octavo.*

The Moral Philosophy of the *Stoicks*. *Octavo.*

A Fathers Testament, written long since for the Benefit of the particular Relation of the Author *Phin. Fletcher*. *Octavo.*

The advice of *Charles* the fifth Emperour of *Germany*, and King of *Spain*; to his Son *Philip* the second, upon his resignation of the Crown of *Spain*, to his said Son. in *Twelves*.

**F I N I S.**

by  
to.  
G,  
ét,

on-  
of  
the  
in

in  
o-  
x-  
re  
py  
o-

o-

o.  
r  
é

f  
-  
é